

IMPACT OF  
DISPERSION ASSUMPTIONS  
ON THE  
ESTIMATED BENEFITS OF  
REDUCING SO<sub>2</sub>  
AND  
PARTICULATE MATTER EMISSIONS

JULY 1990



Ontario

Environment  
Environnement

Jim Bradley, Minister/ministre



IMPACT OF DISPERSION ASSUMPTIONS ON THE ESTIMATED BENEFITS  
OF REDUCING SO<sub>2</sub> AND PARTICULATE MATTER EMISSIONS

Report Prepared by:  
The DPA Group Inc.,  
in association with  
Monenco Consultants Ltd.

Report prepared for:  
Policy and Planning Branch  
Ontario Ministry of the Environment

JULY 1990



Copyright: Queen's Printer for Ontario, 1990  
This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes  
with appropriate attribution.

log 90-1104-009  
PIBS 1083



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgement	
ABSTRACT	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2.0 SCOPE AND APPROACH .....	3
2.1 Scope of the Earlier Study .....	3
2.2 Estimated Benefits Attributed to Reduced Emissions of Sulphur Dioxide and Particulate Matter .....	5
2.3 The Procedure Used to Estimate Public Benefits .....	7
2.4 The Scope of This Study .....	9
2.5 Sample Selection .....	10
2.6 Scaling the Sample to the Population Total .....	14
2.7 Consolidation of Stack Types .....	17
2.8 Dispersion Modelling .....	18
2.8.1 The Modelling Assumptions Used in the Previous Study .....	18
2.8.2 The Modelling Assumptions Used in the Present Study .....	19
2.9 Analyses .....	20
2.10 Discussion of Dispersion Modelling Results .....	22
3.0 SULPHUR DIOXIDE .....	27
3.1 Previous Results .....	27
3.2 Revisions to Previous Results .....	28
3.3 Sample Estimation of Benefits .....	29
3.4 Impact of the Revised Deposition Footprints .....	30
3.5 Impact of Using Actual Emissions Data .....	32
3.6 Threshold Exceedances of Sulphur Dioxide Concentrations ..	33
4.0 SUSPENDED PARTICULATE MATTER .....	35
4.1 Previous Results .....	35
4.2 Sample Estimation of Benefits .....	37
4.3 Impact of the Revised Deposition Footprints .....	39
4.4 Impact of Using Actual Emissions Data .....	40
4.5 Threshold Exceedances of Particulate Matter Concentrations .....	42
4.6 Impacts on Visibility .....	43

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
5.0 CONCLUSIONS .....	45
5.1 Revised Results .....	45
5.2 Interpretation of the Results .....	48
5.3 Exposure-Response Functions .....	49
REFERENCES .....	52
APPENDIX A - Dispersion Modelling of Selected Sources of SO <sub>2</sub> Particulate	
APPENDIX B - Exposure-Response Functions	
APPENDIX C - Regulation 308 Implementation Scenarios	

\*\*\*\*\*

## Acknowledgement

Thanks are due to Drs. P.K. Misra and Rob Bloxam for valuable discussion on our data reduction efforts and review of our final selection of sources and associated source data prior to commencement of model runs. We are also grateful to Dr. David Yap and Simon Wong for time and effort expended in providing source characteristic and emission data.

## ABSTRACT

A September 1988 report on the Estimated Public Benefits of Implementing the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308 for the Ministry of the Environment estimated that significant benefits would accrue from lower emissions of sulphur dioxide and particulate matter.

This report examines the impacts of using more accurate stack data and actual emissions, where available, on the estimates of the public benefits attributed to reduced emissions of sulphur dioxide and particulate matter.

The analysis is performed using a stratified random sample of identified sources.

Using stack characteristics and actual emissions for the selected sample of sources and extrapolating to all sources produces estimates that are generally 20 to 25 percent of the values presented in the previous report.

The revised results should still be interpreted as being broad approximations, that provide a rough indication of the nature and magnitude of the public benefits attributable to implementation of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308.



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A September 1988 report on the Estimated Public Benefits of Implementing the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308 for the Ministry of the Environment estimated that significant benefits would accrue from lower emissions of sulphur dioxide and particulate matter.

This report examines the impacts of using more accurate stack data and actual emissions, where available, on the estimates of the public benefits attributed to reduced emissions of sulphur dioxide and particulate matter.

The analysis is performed using a stratified random sample of identified sources. The 19 sources selected for the sulphur dioxide sample collectively emit 56.9 percent of the total estimated emissions affected by the proposed revisions to Regulation 308. The 29 sources selected for the particulate matter sample emit 32.4 percent of the total emissions affected by the proposed revisions to Regulation 308.

The selected establishments presented a combined total of 265 individual stacks. In principle, each stack should be modelled separately. Since that would create an unmanageable workload, stacks with similar characteristics were grouped. A total of 49 different stack types were defined for the 29 sources.

All of the 105 stacks of less than 30 m were treated as virtual sources with the same dispersion pattern. The remaining 160 stacks were grouped (per plant) according to characteristics such as height, temperature, contribution to total plant emissions, etc. The emissions were pooled accordingly.

Three analyses are performed separately for sulphur dioxide and particulate matter and their respective categories of public benefits. They are:

- . determination of benefits for the sample sources using estimated emissions and the previous dispersion patterns for comparison with the benefits calculated previously using all sources. This gives an indication of the representativeness of the sample.
- . determination of benefits for the sample sources using estimated emissions and the new dispersion patterns for comparison with the sample results calculated above. This gives an indication of the impact of stack characteristics assumptions on the benefits estimates.
- . determination of benefits for the sample sources using actual emissions and the new dispersion patterns for comparison with the results calculated above. This gives an indication of the impact of using actual emissions data on the benefits estimates.

In addition, the derivation and application of all exposure-response functions was verified. This study uses exposure-response functions derived from macro-epidemiological studies. And it assumes that health and other benefits occur at below threshold concentrations. Further, the exposure-response functions are assumed to be linear and to be independent for each contaminant. If, contrary to these assumptions, benefits can be realized only above some threshold level, then the benefits will be somewhat smaller than the estimates presented.

Using stack characteristics and actual emissions for the selected sample of sources and extrapolating to all sources produces the following estimates of the public benefits associated with the proposed revisions to Regulation 308.

## SULPHUR DIOXIDE

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	56	70	19	19
Reduction in Hospital Days for Respiratory Conditions	1,341	1,686	448	460
Reduction in Hospital Admissions for Respiratory Disease	36	171	45	47
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$)	\$ 123 - \$ 389	\$ 155 - \$ 489	\$ 41 - \$ 130	\$ 42 - \$ 134
Value of Non-Lethal Health Benefits (millions of 1986 \$)	\$1 - \$3	\$1 - \$4	< \$1	< \$1

## PARTICULATE MATTER

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	11	12	5	8
Reduction in Emergency Room Visits	637	681	321	492
Reduction in Restricted Activity Days	133,500	142,500	67,000	103,000
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$)	\$ 24 - \$ 76	\$ 26 - \$ 83	\$ 11 - \$ 35	\$ 18 - \$ 56

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Value of Non-Lethal Health Benefits (millions of 1986 \$)	\$1 - \$8	\$2 - \$9	\$1 - \$4	\$1 - \$6
Reduced Materials Damage (millions of 1986 \$)	\$1 - \$18	\$1 - \$19	\$1 - \$9	\$1 - \$14

These estimates are generally 20 to 25 percent of the values presented in the previous report.

Some unknown fraction of the emissions of each source are deposited outside the 25 km radius area covered by the dispersion model. Those emissions are lost to the benefit calculation, so the benefits are understated. Using actual stack characteristics raises the fraction of the emissions deposited outside the 25 km radius area by an unknown degree. This understates the benefits further and overstates the difference between the results reported in the previous study and those calculated using actual stack and emissions data.

We recommend that the estimated visibility benefits for particulate matter be dropped from the analysis.

The revised results should still be interpreted as being broad approximations, that provide a rough indication of the nature and magnitude of the public benefits attributable to implementation of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

A September 1988 report on the Estimated Public Benefits of Implementing the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308 for the Ministry of the Environment estimated that significant benefits would accrue from lower emissions of sulphur dioxide and particulate matter. The above study addressed the benefits associated with lower emissions of almost 100 contaminants resulting from proposed revisions to Regulation 308.

Emissions data and exposure-response functions were not available for many of the contaminants. For those contaminants where benefits could be estimated, reductions in sulphur dioxide and particulate matter emissions dominate the reduced mortality and non-lethal health benefits. Lower particulate matter emissions were also estimated to yield benefits as a result of reduced materials damage and improved visibility.

Overall, sulphur dioxide and particulate matter accounted for 40 to 50 percent of the public benefits associated with implementation of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 that could be quantified.

The earlier study, of necessity, employed a variety of procedures and assumptions to estimate emissions of each contaminant by establishment and the dispersion of those estimated emissions. In light of the major contribution of sulphur dioxide and particulate matter to the overall benefits, an analysis of the impacts of some of the procedures and assumptions on the benefits estimates is appropriate.

This report examines the impacts of using more accurate stack data and actual emissions, where available, on the estimates of the public benefits. Data on stack characteristics and actual emissions of sulphur dioxide and particulate matter are not available for all of the identified sources. In addition, the computational workload involved in modelling each source is large. Hence, the analysis of the impacts is performed using a stratified random sample of identified sources.<sup>1</sup>

The next chapter discusses the sample selection, consolidation of stack types and dispersion modelling results. The impacts on the benefits estimates are presented in Chapter 3 and 4 for sulphur dioxide and particulate matter respectively. The conclusions are presented in Chapter 5.

---

<sup>1</sup> A stratified random sample is a sample that draws a different fraction of the population from each of several strata. In this case there are a few large sources of emissions and numerous small sources. Since the benefits are determined by the change in quantity emitted, it is important to ensure that the large sources are included in the sample. Hence, the sources are stratified on the basis of their estimated emissions and the stratified sample includes all of the large sources and a small fraction of the many small sources, see Section 2.5.

## 2.0 SCOPE AND APPROACH

### 2.1 Scope of the Earlier Study

The earlier study identified the air quality, health and environmental benefits expected from implementation of proposed revisions to Regulation 308.<sup>2</sup> It covered 96 contaminants emitted by over 3,500 establishments in 48 industries across Ontario. Benefits were estimated under five scenarios for implementation of the proposed revisions. The implementation scenarios are described in Appendix C.

The public benefits of reduced contaminant emissions depend upon:

- . the contaminant whose emissions are reduced;
- . the change in concentration of that contaminant at each point;
- . the population and environmental resources in the areas where concentrations are reduced; and
- . the human health and environmental responses to the reduced concentrations.

Data on estimated annual emissions by contaminant for each economic sector, under the present regulations and under the five scenarios for implementation of

---

<sup>2</sup> The DPA Group Inc., Estimated Public Benefits of Implementing the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, September, 1988.



the proposed revisions to Regulation 308, were provided by a related study.<sup>3</sup> The emissions data covered only 54 of the 96 contaminants.

The dispersion of those emissions was estimated using the new models developed by the Ministry of the Environment for use with Regulation 308. The dispersion pattern determined the population and environmental resources exposed to emissions of each contaminant.

Reduced concentrations resulting from lower emissions due to implementation of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 yield public benefits in the form of:

- . lower risk of mortality;
- . systemic health benefits;
- . fewer exposures to above health-threshold concentrations of contaminants;
- . improved visibility;
- . less materials damage; and
- . smaller areas of agricultural land exposed to above threshold concentrations of contaminants.

Coverage of these benefits was incomplete because our knowledge of the effects of a contaminant is often limited. Possible benefits related to animal (domestic and wildlife) health, commercial forest areas, wilderness areas, aquatic toxicity, surface water and odour were not estimated due to data or methodological limitations.

The absence of an exposure-response function does not mean there is no benefit, and the lack of an economic estimate does not mean the benefit has no value.

---

<sup>3</sup> It is our understanding that the emissions estimates prepared by Senes Consultants Ltd. are being reviewed by the Ministry of the Environment. This analysis uses the industry totals estimated by Senes and reported in the earlier study.



The study results highlight the few cases where public benefits could be quantified and associated economic values could be estimated. As a result, the benefits were understated.

The results provided a rough indication of the nature and magnitude of the public benefits attributable to implementation of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308. The results are defensible if used properly. They are broad approximations; not precise estimates. Considerable scope for refinement and enhancement remains.

## **2.2 Estimated Benefits Attributed to Reduced Emissions of Sulphur Dioxide and Particulate Matter**

The total value of the public benefits for which an economic value was estimated ranges between \$1.2 and \$4.0 billion annually for the least stringent implementation scenario. The most stringent implementation scenario yielded benefits with an economic value of \$3.3 to \$7.7 billion per year.

Sulphur dioxide and particulate matter are the source of a significant share of these benefits. That is due, in part, to the availability of exposure-response functions for these contaminants and the lack of exposure-response functions for most other contaminants.

The public benefits estimated for the reduction in sulphur dioxide emissions that would be achieved by the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 are as shown in Exhibit 2.1. The benefits stem primarily from reduced mortality. Functions are available to estimate a wider range of benefits due to lower particulate matter emissions. These are also shown in Exhibit 2.1. The particulate matter benefits are dominated by improved visibility, with reduced mortality being the second largest category.

---

**EXHIBIT 2.1: ESTIMATED PUBLIC BENEFITS DUE TO REDUCED EMISSIONS OF SULPHUR DIOXIDE AND PARTICULATE MATTER**

---

<u>SULPHUR DIOXIDE</u>	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/Year)	250	300	97	97
Reduction in Hospital Days for Respiratory Conditions	3,746	4,495	1,458	1,458
Reduction in Hospital Admissions for Respiratory Disease	381	457	148	148
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$)	\$ 550 - \$1,738	\$ 660 - \$2,085	\$ 213 - \$ 674	\$ 213 - \$ 674
Value of Non-Lethal Health Benefits (millions of 1986 \$)	\$2 - \$9	\$3 - \$10	\$1 - \$3	\$1 - \$3
Economic Value of Reduced Sulphur Dioxide Emissions (millions of 1986 \$)	\$ 552 - \$1,747	\$ 663 - \$2,095	\$ 214 - \$ 677	\$ 214 - \$ 677

---

<u>PARTICULATE MATTER</u>	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/Year)	50	54	25	36
Reduction in Emergency Room Visits	2,940	3,188	1,492	2,117
Reduction in Restricted Activity Days	616,000	668,000	313,000	443,000
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$)	\$ 110 - \$ 348	\$ 119 - \$ 375	\$ 55 - \$ 174	\$ 79 - \$ 250
Value of Non-Lethal Health Benefits (millions of 1986 \$)	\$7 - \$38	\$7 - \$41	\$3 - \$19	\$4 - \$27
Improved Visibility (millions of 1986 \$)	\$ 653 - \$1,306	\$ 700 - \$1,400	\$ 328 - \$ 657	\$ 583 - \$1,167
Reduced Materials Damage (millions of 1986 \$)	\$6 - \$83	\$6 - \$92	\$3 - \$42	\$4 - \$60
Economic Value of Reduced Particulate Matter Emissions (millions of 1986 \$)	\$ 776 - \$1,775	\$ 832 - \$1,908	\$ 389 - \$ 892	\$ 670 - \$1,504

---

Together these two contaminants account for 40 to 50 percent of the total benefits which could be estimated for the lower emissions that would result from implementation of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308. In light of the major contribution of sulphur dioxide and particulate matter to the overall benefits, an analysis of some of the procedures and assumptions used to derive these estimates is appropriate. This is especially true given the estimated impacts of these contaminants on mortality, and the fact that they account for 90 to 95 percent of the total estimated reduction in mortality.

### **2.3 The Procedure Used to Estimate Public Benefits**

To appreciate the potential significance of some of the assumptions used, it helps to understand the method used to estimate the public benefits.

The benefits are estimated using an exposure-response function. Each function determines a particular benefit (e.g., reduced mortality) as a function of the change in concentration of the contaminant and the resources (e.g., population) exposed. The exposure-response functions used for sulphur dioxide and particulate matter are described in Appendix B.

To apply the exposure-response functions it is necessary to know the current concentration of the contaminant at each point, the estimated concentration of the contaminant at each point after the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 have been implemented and the population (or other appropriate environmental resource) at that point. The calculations were performed using a 4 km grid. The current and projected concentrations were calculated at the centre of each grid cell. The change in concentration was assumed to apply to the entire 4 km by 4 km cell. The population exposed is the population of the grid cell. The calculations involve over 15,000 grid cells.

The benefits are a function of the change in contaminant concentration. The proposed revisions to Regulation 308 affect the emissions by a specific establishment. To relate the contaminant emissions to ambient concentrations it is necessary to:

- . model the dispersion of emissions over the area surrounding each establishment; and
- . aggregate the dispersion patterns for a given contaminant that affect each grid cell centre.

The latter step is a mechanical process. The dispersion modelling, in contrast, is a complex technical exercise that requires extensive data on the characteristics of the stacks, the emission flows and the local meteorological conditions. In the first study several simplifying assumptions were used with respect to stack characteristics and emissions flows to compensate for incomplete data and to ease the computational burden. The primary purpose of this study is to examine the impact of the assumptions relating to stack characteristics.

The emissions of a specific contaminant by an establishment, both at present and under the proposed revisions to Regulation 308, were estimated. A related study provided industry totals for each contaminant at present and for each proposed regulatory scenario.<sup>4</sup> The industry totals were apportioned across the establishments in the industry, usually on the basis of employment. This study also examines the impacts of using actual emissions rather than estimated emissions.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Senes Consultants Ltd., Estimation of Additional Abatement Costs for the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308, forthcoming.

<sup>5</sup> As noted in footnote 3, the industry totals estimated by Senes Consultants Ltd are being reviewed by the Ministry of the Environment. Those industry totals are used in this analysis as well. They are used to derive the estimated emissions by establishment

## 2.4 The Scope of This Study

This study examines the impact on the benefits estimates for sulphur dioxide and particulate matter of:

- . using more accurate data for stack characteristics and emission flows in the dispersion modelling; and
- . using actual emissions by establishment rather than the estimated emissions.

In all other respects the procedure described above is unchanged.

The proposed revisions to Regulation 308 were estimated to affect 177 sources of sulphur dioxide, emitting a total of 87,995 tonnes annually. Sources of sulphur dioxide emissions covered by the province's acid rain initiative were excluded because reductions achieved by those sources would not be attributable to the proposed revisions to Regulation 308. Some 1,091 sources of particulate matter emitting 92,208 tonnes annually were included in the earlier public benefits analysis.

Many sources have multiple stacks.<sup>6</sup> In principle, the dispersion of emissions from each stack must be modelled separately. The dispersion modelling was performed

---

(source). The actual emissions by establishment (as provided by the Ministry of the Environment) for the establishments in the samples are used to estimate the benefits of lower emissions on the presumption that the Senes estimate of the total emissions by the industry is correct.

<sup>6</sup> A source is a separate plant or establishment. A source can have multiple stacks. In the terminology of dispersion modelling each stack is referred to as a source. In this report a source is always an establishment with one or more stacks.

using the new models developed by the Ministry of the Environment for use with Regulation 308. These models operate on a personal computer. Each run can take up to eight hours. Clearly, separate modelling of each of several stacks for roughly 1,100 establishments is a mammoth undertaking. Time and budget constraints did not allow such an undertaking. The results, for smaller sources, would not justify the effort. And, in any event, the requisite stack data are not available for many smaller establishments.

Therefore, the analysis in this study was performed using a stratified random sample of establishments that emit sulphur dioxide and/or particulate matter.

## **2.5 Sample Selection**

The estimated emissions from an individual source vary from a fraction of a tonne to thousands of tonnes per year. The larger sources are more likely to have stack characteristics that differ from those assumed in the dispersion modelling. The largest sources also tend to have the greatest impact in determining the benefits of lower emissions. (Proximity to population centres is the other key variable.) Hence, a stratified sample that ensures higher coverage of the largest sources is adopted for the analysis.

Since virtually all emitters of sulphur dioxide are also sources of particulate matter, the sulphur dioxide sample is selected first and those establishments are then augmented as necessary to get the desired coverage of particulate matter sources. Drawing a completely independent sample of particulate matter sources would increase the dispersion modelling work with no gain in accuracy.

A sample of 20 establishments is desired for the analysis of changes in emissions of sulphur dioxide. The sample is stratified to provide the following coverage:



. all sources with estimated emissions greater than 3,000 tonnes/year	4
. one-third of the sources with estimated emissions between 500 and 3,000 tonnes/year	9
. 5% of the sources with estimated emissions of less than 500 tonnes/year	<u>7</u>
Total sample	20

A sample of 30 establishments is desired for the analysis of changes in emissions of particulate matter. The 20 establishments in the sulphur dioxide sample are also part of the particulate matter sample to reduce the dispersion modelling effort. The particulate matter sample is stratified as follows:

	SO <sub>2</sub> Sample	PM Only	Total
. all sources with estimated emissions greater than 3,000 tonnes/year	1	3	4
. 25% of the sources with estimated emissions between 500 and 3,000 tonnes/year	6	4	10
. 1.5% of the sources with estimated emissions of less than 500 tonnes/year	<u>13</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>16</u>
Total sample	20	10	30

The required stack data were not available for all of the randomly selected establishments. As result, some replacement sources were drawn among the smallest firms and one of the intermediate sources was dropped due to lack of availability of data.

The list of sources selected for the samples is provided in Exhibit 2.2.

EXHIBIT 2.2: SO<sub>2</sub> AND PARTICULATE SOURCES DATA SUMMARY

PLANT NAME	CITY	FILE NAME	MET. FILE NAME	TOTAL SO <sub>2</sub> (MT/yr)	TOTAL PARTIC. (MT/yr)	TOTAL NO OF STKS.	TOTAL NO OF ELEV. SRCs.	NO OF VIRT. SRCs.	STK. I.D.	SO <sub>2</sub> per STK. (MT/yr)	PARTIC. per STK. (MT/yr)	H-SO <sub>2</sub> FRACTION (g/n-normalized)	N-PART. FRACTION	STACK HEIGHT (m)	EXIT VELOC. (m/s)	STACK RADIUS (m)	EXT. DMF. (m)	SAMPLE SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
1 ABITEBI PRIZE (PVD)	THUNDER BAY	THU	THU	3.0	224.0	3	1	1	1	0.1	90.3	0.033	0.403	34.23	6.44	1.79	307	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
2 * ATLANTIC PACKAGING	SCARBOROUGH	TOR	TOR	0.5	39.6	3	0	1	0	2.9	133.7	0.967	0.397	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
3 * BEAVER WOOD FIBRE	THORNHILL	SOB	SOB	1.2	1.1	2	2	0	1	0.5	39.6	1.000	1.000	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
4 BROCKV (NITROCHINA)	MAITLAND	KIN	KIN	61.9	93.0	6	2	1	5	1.2	1.1	1.000	1.000	50.00	13.69	0.43	346	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
5 C-F-L	COURTSHOIT	WIN	WIN	113.4	263.5	15	8	1	1	66.0	21.1	0.382	0.018	32.00	21.70	1.50	472	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
6 CAN/CEMENT LAFARGE	NR BATH	KIN	KIN	1710.0	390.1	14	18	0	7	0.0	193.7	0.000	0.502	46.00	50.70	0.73	318	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
7 * CANADA METAL CO LTD	TORONTO	TOR	TOR	715.2	81.6	8	1	1	9	1710.0	194.4	1.000	0.498	76.00	8.60	1.55	439	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
8 * DOPASCO INC	HAMILTON	TOR	TOR	6125.7	1642.5	9	6	1	2	713.2	43.9	1.000	0.808	46.00	31.36	0.90	352	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
9 DOMTAR PACKING LTD	RED ROCK	TOR	TOR	647.3	2392.4	1	1	0	1	647.3	2392.4	1.000	1.000	50.00	5.00	0.45	366	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
10 EDDY FOREST PROD.	ESPANOLA	SOO	SOO	1379.5	2659.7	4	4	0	1	1326.6	1994.2	0.962	0.351	77.00	13.91	1.83	477	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
11 FED WHITE CEMENT	WOODSTOCK	LOH	LOH	552.8	23.4	6	2	1	2	132.5	7.5	0.776	0.312	32.40	0.50	0.92	373	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
12 GREAT LAKES FOREST	THUNDER BAY	THU	THU	243.3	1624.3	3	5	0	1	403.3	16.1	0.724	0.084	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
13 GULF/PETCOAN CLARKSON	MISSISSAUGA	TOR	TOR	4817.8	339.0	26	11	1	20	2384.1	63.4	0.497	0.163	70.00	19.70	1.03	336	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
14 IMPERIAL OIL	SARNIA	WIN	WIN	1995.5	134.0	12	12	1	7	16667.3	116.0	0.851	0.753	91.00	11.20	1.60	617	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
15 INDALLOY LTD	NORTH YORK	TOR	TOR	0.2	10.3	2	0	1	0	0.2	10.3	1.000	1.000	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
16 KIDD CREEK MINES	THORNHILL	TOR	TOR	4772.2	185.8	6	3	0	4	2785.1	60.7	0.452	0.377	43.00	27.70	0.63	313	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.
									5	1487.1	121.1	0.348	0.673	74.00	16.00	0.46	360	SO <sub>2</sub> Part.



# EXHIBIT 2.2: SO<sub>2</sub> AND PARTICULATE SOURCES DATA SUMMARY (Continued)

PLANT NAME	CITY	FILE NAME	MET. FILE NAME	TOTAL SO <sub>2</sub> PARTIC. (kg/yr)	TOTAL PARTIC. STKS	TOTAL NO OF ELEV. STKS	NO OF STKS	STL. I.D. (m)	SO <sub>2</sub> per STL. (kg/yr)	PARTIC. per STL. (kg/yr)	N-SON FRACTION (g/s-normalized)	N-PART FRACTION	STACK HEIGHT (m)	EXIT VELOC. (m/s)	STACK RADIUS (m)	EXIT TEMP. (°C)	SAMPLE SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.	
17 LAKE ONTARIO CEMENT	PICTON	TRE		7748.2	184.3	6	6	0	1	7748.2	184.3	1.000	1.000	37.00	26.20	1.20	450	SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.
18 LAKEVIEW O.S.	MISSISSAUGA	TOR		43358	820.0	4	4	0	1	43358	820.0	1.000	1.000	150.50	28.80	2.97	411	PAR.
19 LEVINOX O.S.	BATH	KIN		0.0	0.0	2	2	0	1	0.0	0.0	1.000	1.000	199.00	55.14	5.76	414	PAR.
20 MALLETT BRAPT P&P	SMOOTH ROCK FALLS	TOR		281.1	1806.2	9	7	1	5	251.5	1340.2	0.893	0.742	38.40	14.69	0.46	332	SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.
		TOR						0	29.6	466.0	0.103	0.238	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	PAR.	
21 NANTICOKE O.S.	NANTICOKE	SIM		168000	2400	2	2	0	1	168000	2400	1.000	1.000	198.10	30.50	2.75	394	PAR.
22 NORTHERN POWER LT	TORONTO	TOR		7.1	15.6	7	0	1	0	7.1	15.6	1.000	1.000	14.00	10.80	0.30	542	SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.
23 ONTARIO PAPER CO LT	THOROLD	SIM		1099.2	5.7	7	7	0	6	1099.2	5.7	1.000	1.000	41.70	25.70	0.54	558	PAR.
24 PETROSAR LTD	CORUNNA	WIN		6259.6	807.3	4	2	1	2	4694.2	605.5	0.750	0.750	61.00	6.40	1.40	441	SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.
		WIN						0	1563.4	201.8	0.250	0.250	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	PAR.	
25 POLYSAR LTD	SARNIA	WIN		1650.6	139.2	40	8	0	1	1650.6	139.2	1.000	1.000	91.50	20.00	2.82	445	PAR.
26 ST MARY CEMENT	ST MARY	LON		3194.2	124.0	59	34	1	2	878.9	24.4	0.275	0.197	88.39	5.10	0.38	400	SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.
		LON						24	7.0	64.6	0.001	0.521	55.78	18.10	0.84	450	SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.	
		LON						0	2513.5	35.0	0.724	0.582	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	PAR.	
27 STRATHCONA PAPER CO	NAPANEE	KIN		20.1	1.9	1	0	1	0	20.1	1.9	1.000	1.000	9.10	9.40	0.76	463	SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.
28 SUNCOR	SARNIA	WIN		2662.0	95.0	20	17	0	1	2395.5	55.0	0.899	0.579	77.72	4.91	1.68	410	SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.
		WIN						18	368.5	40.0	0.101	0.421	38.10	3.78	0.73	542	SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.	
29 TEXACO CAN (NANT.)	NANTICOKE	SIM		6210.0	561.0	5	4	0	1	4716.9	398.4	0.760	0.710	112.00	8.60	3.05	506	SO <sub>2</sub> PAR.
		SIM						5	1493.1	162.6	0.240	0.290	56.00	4.50	1.05	384	NO. OF PLANTS	
				TOTAL TOTAL SO <sub>2</sub> PARTIC.	# OF STKS	# OF ELEV. STKS	# OF VRT. STKS	# OF RUNS	TOTAL SO <sub>2</sub> PARTIC.	TOTAL PARTIC.	QC NORMALIZED	TEST PARTIC.	MAX.	MAX.	MAX.	MAX.	NO. OF PLANTS	
				284802	17412	264	160	13	49	734807	17412	1.000	1.000	199.00	55.14	3.76	417.00	19

NOTES: \* - New Source Selections/Replaces - New Source Selections/Replaces - Preliminary Selections of SO<sub>2</sub> - Preliminary Selections of Particulate Emissions per Stack. 60 refers to a virtual source, others are elevated sources. - Normalized SO<sub>2</sub> and Particulate Emissions per Stack.

Source Name have been reduced from 160 to 160 by applying the ratio of a building height of 14.0 m. Thus, 40 blocks of elevation that are equal to 28.0 m become virtual (building) water sources.

Particulate emissions from have been reduced from 160 to 34 by 447 repeating emissions from individual stacks to stacks of similar characteristics. Additionally, where emissions rates for remaining individual stacks are less than 7% of total emissions (SO<sub>2</sub> or Particulate), then emissions have been approximated to the source of nearest characteristics (either elevated or virtual).

Virtual Source Name would utilize identical building parameters. For example, Toronto meteorology would be used for 6 plants. If building parameters are set to be identical, a single building source can then be applied to all 6 plants. Thus, the total number of virtual runs drops from 15 to 6. That then reduces the total number of all runs from 49 to 40.

METROLOGY FILE ABBREVIATIONS	KIN	LON	SIM	SCO	THU	TIM	TOR	WIN
ABBREVIATIONS	Kinross	London	Sarnia	South St. Mary	Thunder Bay	Toronto	Toronto	Windsor

The distribution of sources achieved for the sulphur dioxide and particulate matter samples is as follows:

	SO <sub>2</sub> Sample	PM Only
. sources with estimated emissions greater than 3,000 tonnes/year	4	4
. sources with estimated emissions between 500 and 3,000 tonnes/year	8	11
. sources with estimated emissions of less than 500 tonnes/year	<u>7</u>	<u>14</u>
Total sample	19	29

## 2.6 Scaling the Sample to the Population Total

The 19 sources selected for the sulphur dioxide sample collectively emit 56.9 percent of the total estimated emissions affected by the proposed revisions to Regulation 308.<sup>7</sup> The scale factors to adjust the estimated emissions of the sample sources to the estimated emissions of all establishments in the emission size category are as follows:

---

<sup>7</sup> The total estimated emissions of sulphur dioxide are those estimated by Senes Consultants Ltd. for all industries that emit sulphur dioxide and which would be affected by the proposed revisions to Regulation 308. That total is 87,995 tonnes annually.

### Scale Factor<sup>8</sup>

large: over 3,000 tonnes/year	1.0000
intermediate: 500 to 3,000 tonnes/year	3.1353
small: under 500 tonnes/year	9.7715

These scale factors are used to assess the impact of using source specific stack and emissions characteristics.

The actual emissions of sulphur dioxide reported by the Ministry for a specific establishment differ significantly from the estimated emissions.<sup>9</sup> The actual emissions of many of the sample establishments do not fall within the limits of the stratum for which the source was selected, i.e., an establishment selected because it was estimated to be a large (over 3,000 tonnes/year) source might have much lower (under 500 tonnes/year) emissions. When assessing the impact of using actual emissions, the sample sources are treated as random selections from the overall population. The actual emissions from the 19 establishments total

---

<sup>8</sup> The scale factor is calculated by dividing the estimated emissions of sulphur dioxide from all sources in a size category by the estimated emissions of the sources selected as part of the sample. The four large sources have estimated emissions of 35,170 tonnes per year; all four sources are part of the sample so the estimated emissions are 35,170 tonnes per year and the scale factor is 1.0000. The 27 intermediate sources have combined emissions of 43,870 tonnes annually while the 8 selected for the sample have combined emissions of 13,992 tonnes per year. Hence the scale factor is  $43,870/13,992 = 3.1353$ . Finally, the 146 small sources have combined emissions of 8,955 tonnes per year while the 7 sources selected have total emissions of 916 tonnes annually, giving a scale factor of 9.7715.

<sup>9</sup> There are many possible explanations for the differences between the actual and estimated emissions for a given source. The major reason is probably the procedure used to estimate the emissions of a particular establishment from the industry total as estimated by Senes Consultants Ltd. Actual data refer to a specific year and may not be representative of normal operating patterns. Actual emissions data are not available for all establishments, so an estimation procedure had to be used in the earlier study.

53,500 tonnes per year. A factor of 1.6448 is used to scale the sample impacts to the population total.<sup>10</sup>

The 29 sources selected for the particulate matter sample emit an estimated 29,896 tonnes per year, 32.4 percent of the total emissions affected by the proposed revisions to Regulation 308. The scale factors to adjust the estimated emissions of the sample sources to the estimated emissions of all establishments in the emission size category are as follows:

Scale Factor<sup>11</sup>

large: over 3,000 tonnes/year	1.0000
intermediate: 500 to 3,000 tonnes/year	4.0140
small: under 500 tonnes/year	8.1147

These scale factors are used to assess the impact of using source specific stack and emissions characteristics.

The actual emissions of particulates reported by the Ministry for a specific establishment differ from the estimated emissions. The variations are not as large as in the case of sulphur dioxide, but a number of the selected sources report actual emissions outside the size category for which they were selected. Hence,

---

<sup>10</sup> The estimated emissions from the population of 177 sulphur dioxide sources is 87,995 tonnes annually. The actual emissions by the 19 establishments selected for the sample is 53,500 tonnes per year. Hence, the scale factor is  $87,995/53,500 = 1.6448$ .

<sup>11</sup> The scale factors relate the estimated emissions of the sample sources to those of all sources. The four large sources emit 14,975 tonnes of particulate annually. They are all part of the sample so the scale factor is 1.0000. The 38 intermediate sources have combined emissions of 42,924 tonnes per year. The 11 sources included in the sample have combined emissions of 10,694 tonnes annually, giving a scale factor of  $42,924/10,694 = 4.0140$ . The 1,049 small sources have combined emissions of 34,309 tonnes per year. The 14 sources selected for the sample have combined emissions of 4,228 tonnes annually, giving a scale factor of 8.1147.

when assessing the impact of using actual emissions, the sample sources are treated as random selections from the overall population. The actual emissions from the 29 establishments total 17,417 tonnes per year. A factor of 5.2942 is used to scale the sample impacts to the population total.<sup>12</sup>

## 2.7 Consolidation of Stack Types

Actual stack characteristics were provided by the Ministry for the final sample of 29 sources of sulphur dioxide and/or particulate emissions. The selected establishments presented a combined total of 265 individual stacks. In principle, each stack should be modelled separately. The time and effort involved in modelling 265 sources with different apportionments of emissions for sulphur dioxide and particulate is excessive. To reduce the modelling effort, a more manageable number of representative stacks was developed with the concurrence of the Ministry's Model Development Unit.

A virtual source is one where the dispersion pattern is determined by the building rather than the stack. Sources where the stack height is less than twice the height of the building are modelled as virtual sources. Since the Ministry has no data available on building dimensions, a reasonable assumption of these dimensions was required. A typical virtual source was defined as one of 14 m height, 50 m width, and stack elevation less than 28 m. Thus stacks of less than about 30 m elevation could be considered virtual sources.<sup>13</sup> All of the 105 stacks of less than 30 m were treated as virtual sources with the same dispersion pattern.

---

<sup>12</sup> The scale factor is calculated by relating the actual emissions of 17,417 tonnes per year to the estimated total of 92,208 ( $92,208/17,417 = 5.2942$ ).

<sup>13</sup> Note that the building height chosen was exactly double, and the width one-half of that chosen in the previous study. This simplifies comparisons with the previous effort, and provides additional information on the sensitivity of the dispersion field to building dimensions. See The DPA Group Inc., Estimated Public Benefits of Implementing the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, September, 1988.

The remaining 160 stacks were grouped (per plant) according to characteristics such as height, temperature, contribution to total plant emissions, etc. The emissions were pooled accordingly. In addition, emissions from "stray stacks", those contributing less than 7 percent of total plant emissions, were distributed among the remaining most-similar stacks or virtual sources.

After the consolidation process had been completed, a total of 49 different stack types were defined for the 29 sources. These are described in Exhibit 2.2. They provide good coverage of high elevated, moderately elevated, low elevated and virtual sources.

## **2.8 Dispersion Modelling**

### **2.8.1 The Modelling Assumptions Used in the Previous Study**

In the previous study, a standard source was defined and modelled for each meteorological area of the province.<sup>14</sup> The dispersion modelling yielded annual average ambient concentration values for an area extending 24 km in each direction from the source. A different dispersion concentration "footprint" was created for each meteorological area. The dispersion of emissions from a particular source was mapped by selecting the footprint for that meteorological area, locating the origin at the emission source and scaling the concentrations for the emission rate of the source establishment.

---

<sup>14</sup> Every source was assumed to have the following characteristics for the purposes of dispersion modelling. The source was assumed to be a typical "industrial park" building with a height of 7 m, a width of 100 m and a stack height of less than 14 m. Emissions are assumed to exit the stack with a velocity of 0 and at ambient exit temperature.



Project scheduling, scope, and data availability at that time did not allow for actual source parameters to be used in the dispersion modelling. Since about 95 percent of the sources in the province emit under virtual source conditions, a typical source was defined as a building of 7 m height, 100 m width, and less than 14 m stack elevation. It was intended that the enhanced building width in this definition would offset to some degree the variability in actual building heights.

Modelling was performed on a 2 km-resolution receptor grid with near-source resolution increased to 500 m and 1,000 m. Since the largest discrepancies between modelled and actual concentrations would be expected to occur inside a 2-3 km radius of an elevated source (~5% of the sources in Ontario), some additional approximations were suggested to offset artificially enhanced concentrations near the source.

For the analysis of public benefits the study reduced the modelled resolution to 4 km on a 48 x 48 km grid. This coincided with the best grid resolution for which population and establishment distribution data were available and also resulted in lower discrepancies between modelled and actual concentrations for the 5 percent of sources which were elevated.

### **2.8.2 The Modelling Assumptions Used in the Present Study**

The meteorology developed previously was used in the present study. Receptor grid resolution was set at 4 km on a 48 x 48 km grid to correspond with the resolution used previously and to facilitate the subsequent benefits analysis.

In the present case, a dispersion field (footprint) was generated for each source at each plant (i.e., 49 in total). As previously, annual average concentrations were generated at each grid point.

Each stack at each plant was assigned an emission rate of 1 g/s.<sup>15</sup> Apportionment of emissions from the stacks at each plant was normalized for each of sulphur dioxide and particulate emissions. The 1 g/s footprints are scaled down, and superimposed to yield a summary footprint equivalent to a total 1 g/s plant emission rate. The summary footprint is different for sulphur dioxide and particulate matter because the proportion of emissions from each stack is not the same for these two contaminants.

The appropriate summary footprint is scaled according to the total plant emissions of sulphur dioxide or particulate matter.

The models are limited to dispersion over a 25 km radius. Beyond this radius the mathematics become unstable. Small quantities of contaminants are dispersed beyond 25 km. These quantities increase with stack height. The quantities dispersed beyond 25 km are "lost" to the benefit calculation.<sup>16</sup> The impact of this effect can not be estimated.

## 2.9 Analyses

Three analyses are performed separately for sulphur dioxide and particulate matter and their respective categories of public benefits. They are:

---

<sup>15</sup> The assumption of a uniform emission rate is necessary due to lack of data and for computational simplicity. Data on the hourly emission rate by stack are not available. If such data were available, the dispersion of emissions from each stack would be unique, because the dispersion depends upon the meteorological conditions prevailing at the time the emissions occur. The analysis uses only annual average ambient concentrations. It is assumed that fluctuations in the emission rate would be dampened by the averaging process. With a uniform emission rate, the same dispersion footprint can be applied to all stacks with similar characteristics in the same meteorological area. The ambient concentrations do reflect differences in the total quantity emitted from each stack.

<sup>16</sup> Technically the modelled concentration at 24 km from the source is applied over a 4 km grid cell that lies between 22 km and 26 km from the source.



- . determination of benefits for the sample sources using estimated emissions and the previous dispersion footprints for comparison with the benefits calculated previously using all sources. This gives an indication of the representativeness of the sample.
- . determination of benefits for the sample sources using estimated emissions and the new dispersion footprints for comparison with the sample results calculated above. This gives an indication of the impact of stack characteristics assumptions on the benefits estimates.
- . determination of benefits for the sample sources using actual emissions and the new dispersion footprints for comparison with the results calculated above. This gives an indication of the impact of using actual emissions data on the benefits estimates.

In addition the derivation and application of all exposure-response functions was verified. These functions are attached as Appendix B.

The impact of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 on current actual emissions was assumed to be the percentage reduction estimated by Senes Consultants for the relevant industry. Actual emissions for sample establishments may be higher or lower than those estimated from the industry totals. These differences may be due to many factors including the control technology currently installed. Regardless of the actual emissions it is assumed that they are reduced at each establishment by the same percentage as estimated by Senes Consultants for the industry as a whole.

## 2.10 Discussion of Dispersion Modelling Results

Comparison was made between previous study output and present study output for a virtual source in Toronto. A point by point comparison is presented in Exhibit 2.3. "TOR-PREV" refers to the previous study, while "AST80386" and "H-R80386" refer to the present study. This showed that the doubling of building height and halving of building width resulted in output concentration data on the 4 km resolution grid that was within about  $\pm 4$  percent of previous results. This agreed with expectations for these sources confirming that the previous building source assumptions would yield representative dispersion footprints for most virtual sources in Ontario.

Output for several multi-source plants was tabulated and individual receptor concentrations were inspected and compared. Anticipated trends in comparing high-elevated, moderately elevated, and virtual source-generated receptor concentrations were confirmed.

An example is provided in Exhibit 2.4. While it is generally the case that annual average ambient concentrations resulting from virtual source assumptions exceed those resulting from elevated source assumptions (on the 48 x 48 km, 4 km resolution grid), it can be observed that for 10 to 15 percent of the receptors, the reverse is true.

Comparing elevated and virtual source effects on annual average ambient concentrations in this example:

- . For half to two thirds of the receptors, elevated source results are within a factor of 2 of the virtual source results.

EXHIBIT 23: - COMPARISON OF CURRENT RUNS WITH PREVIOUS (1988) RUNS TORONTO VIRTUAL SOURCE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523	524	525	526	527	528	529	530	531	532	533	534	535	536	537	538	539	540	541	542	543	544	545	546	547	548	549	550	551	552	553	554	555	556	557	558	559	560	561	562	563	564	565	566	567	568	569	570	571	572	573	574	575	576	577	578	579	580	581	582	583	584	585	586	587	588	589	590	591	592	593	594	595	596	597	598	599	600	601	602	603	604	605	606	607	608	609	610	611	612	613	614	615	616	617	618	619	620	621	622	623	624	625	626	627	628	629	630	631	632	633	634	635	636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801	802	803	804	805	806	807	808	809	810	811	812	813	814	815	816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

[illegible]

z	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100																																																									
0	0.0000	0.0001	0.0002	0.0003	0.0004	0.0005	0.0006	0.0007	0.0008	0.0009	0.0010	0.0011	0.0012	0.0013	0.0014	0.0015	0.0016	0.0017	0.0018	0.0019	0.0020	0.0021	0.0022	0.0023	0.0024	0.0025	0.0026	0.0027	0.0028	0.0029	0.0030	0.0031	0.0032	0.0033	0.0034	0.0035	0.0036	0.0037	0.0038	0.0039	0.0040	0.0041	0.0042	0.0043	0.0044	0.0045	0.0046	0.0047	0.0048	0.0049	0.0050	0.0051	0.0052	0.0053	0.0054	0.0055	0.0056	0.0057	0.0058	0.0059	0.0060	0.0061	0.0062	0.0063	0.0064	0.0065	0.0066	0.0067	0.0068	0.0069	0.0070	0.0071	0.0072	0.0073	0.0074	0.0075	0.0076	0.0077	0.0078	0.0079	0.0080	0.0081	0.0082	0.0083	0.0084	0.0085	0.0086	0.0087	0.0088	0.0089	0.0090	0.0091	0.0092	0.0093	0.0094	0.0095	0.0096	0.0097	0.0098	0.0099	0.0100																																																								
1	0.0044	0.0045	0.0046	0.0047	0.0048	0.0049	0.0050	0.0051	0.0052	0.0053	0.0054	0.0055	0.0056	0.0057	0.0058	0.0059	0.0060	0.0061	0.0062	0.0063	0.0064	0.0065	0.0066	0.0067	0.0068	0.0069	0.0070	0.0071	0.0072	0.0073	0.0074	0.0075	0.0076	0.0077	0.0078	0.0079	0.0080	0.0081	0.0082	0.0083	0.0084	0.0085	0.0086	0.0087	0.0088	0.0089	0.0090	0.0091	0.0092	0.0093	0.0094	0.0095	0.0096	0.0097	0.0098	0.0099	0.0100	0.0101	0.0102	0.0103	0.0104	0.0105	0.0106	0.0107	0.0108	0.0109	0.0110	0.0111	0.0112	0.0113	0.0114	0.0115	0.0116	0.0117	0.0118	0.0119	0.0120	0.0121	0.0122	0.0123	0.0124	0.0125	0.0126	0.0127	0.0128	0.0129	0.0130	0.0131	0.0132	0.0133	0.0134	0.0135	0.0136	0.0137	0.0138	0.0139	0.0140	0.0141	0.0142	0.0143	0.0144	0.0145	0.0146	0.0147	0.0148	0.0149	0.0150	0.0151	0.0152	0.0153	0.0154	0.0155	0.0156	0.0157	0.0158	0.0159	0.0160	0.0161	0.0162	0.0163	0.0164	0.0165	0.0166	0.0167	0.0168	0.0169	0.0170	0.0171	0.0172	0.0173	0.0174	0.0175	0.0176	0.0177	0.0178	0.0179	0.0180	0.0181	0.0182	0.0183	0.0184	0.0185	0.0186	0.0187	0.0188	0.0189	0.0190	0.0191	0.0192	0.0193	0.0194	0.0195	0.0196	0.0197	0.0198	0.0199	0.0200
2	0.0099	0.0100	0.0101	0.0102	0.0103	0.0104	0.0105	0.0106	0.0107	0.0108	0.0109	0.0110	0.0111	0.0112	0.0113	0.0114	0.0115	0.0116	0.0117	0.0118	0.0119	0.0120	0.0121	0.0122	0.0123	0.0124	0.0125	0.0126	0.0127	0.0128	0.0129	0.0130	0.0131	0.0132	0.0133	0.0134	0.0135	0.0136	0.0137	0.0138	0.0139	0.0140	0.0141	0.0142	0.0143	0.0144																																																																																																															

```
NOTE:
- X and Y are coordinates in units of km.
- ASTAD365 refers to DDA computer.
- *EOD365 refers to MCE computer.
- Z difference is 1000(Prav Snow)/Prav.
- All units are m/s2 (per g/s omitted).
```

# EXHIBIT 2.4: COMPARISON OF ELEVATED AND VIRTUAL SOURCES ON A 4-KM RECEPTOR GRID (PETROCANADA, CLARKSON)

Distance (km)	Y	7th St	Concentrations (µg/m³)		Difference Bldg - 7th	Difference Bldg - 5th
			5th St	Bldg		
-24000	-24000	0.00112	0.00082	0.00129	8.05	27.39
-20000	-24000	0.00155	0.00028	0.00189	1.26	27.39
-16000	-24000	0.00136	0.00192	0.00214	39.59	49.48
-12000	-24000	0.001170	0.00124	0.002518	41.63	51.01
-8000	-24000	0.001564	0.00333	0.00340	53.99	66.72
-4000	-24000	0.002259	0.001923	0.003876	41.71	50.37
0	-24000	0.00163	0.002798	0.004517	41.61	48.35
4000	-24000	0.004337	0.003981	0.005423	30.44	38.79
8000	-24000	0.004100	0.00511	0.00942	45.40	52.02
12000	-24000	0.004771	0.004163	0.009752	40.00	47.62
16000	-24000	0.003251	0.002798	0.006083	53.44	59.93
20000	-24000	0.002644	0.002533	0.00515	44.01	58.48
24000	-24000	0.001719	0.00133	0.003107	44.69	59.60
-24000	-20000	0.001121	0.000948	0.000787	-42.47	-19.42
-20000	-20000	0.001327	0.001050	0.001544	16.16	37.06
-16000	-20000	0.001992	0.001096	0.001456	6.34	76.25
-12000	-20000	0.001813	0.001100	0.002875	36.94	47.82
-8000	-20000	0.002007	0.001634	0.004774	57.96	65.77
-4000	-20000	0.002441	0.002014	0.005917	37.69	48.59
0	-20000	0.003194	0.003193	0.006968	43.97	51.28
4000	-20000	0.005164	0.004559	0.008294	37.96	48.24
8000	-20000	0.005173	0.004764	0.011138	50.66	57.23
12000	-20000	0.005433	0.004566	0.013250	59.00	65.54
16000	-20000	0.003770	0.003200	0.007045	46.69	53.30
20000	-20000	0.002157	0.001891	0.006144	47.95	54.36
24000	-20000	0.002197	0.001799	0.002810	21.83	29.18
-24000	-16000	0.000950	0.000689	0.000726	-17.06	-5.13
-20000	-16000	0.001377	0.001136	0.000954	-47.48	-21.43
-16000	-16000	0.001658	0.001503	0.002113	21.33	38.35
-12000	-16000	0.001816	0.001110	0.002423	25.04	41.80
-8000	-16000	0.002258	0.001608	0.004723	52.19	61.72
-4000	-16000	0.002547	0.002125	0.004473	43.06	52.50
0	-16000	0.003076	0.004769	0.009522	47.22	55.17
4000	-16000	0.004273	0.005159	0.012953	51.57	60.17
8000	-16000	0.004803	0.005410	0.016169	56.50	62.47
12000	-16000	0.004407	0.003826	0.008725	48.81	58.40
16000	-16000	0.003337	0.002427	0.006921	52.17	59.01
20000	-16000	0.003609	0.002316	0.004765	45.25	51.40
24000	-16000	0.002556	0.002315	0.003515	30.16	34.71
-24000	-12000	0.001093	0.000945	0.000647	-15.34	0.21
-20000	-12000	0.001260	0.000985	0.001179	-1.77	16.51
-16000	-12000	0.001410	0.001794	0.002415	53.34	48.42

Distance (km)	Y	7th St	Concentrations (µg/m³)		Difference Bldg - 7th	Difference Bldg - 5th
			5th St	Bldg		
-24000	-12000	0.002277	0.001717	0.003210	30.73	46.59
-20000	-12000	0.002682	0.002092	0.004173	56.55	66.11
-16000	-12000	0.003280	0.002595	0.006691	66.84	73.76
-12000	-12000	0.006887	0.005651	0.013366	52.13	60.72
-8000	-12000	0.010228	0.008235	0.022545	62.87	69.93
-4000	-12000	0.009957	0.006596	0.019971	65.16	72.49
0	-12000	0.003968	0.003391	0.009426	57.91	64.98
4000	-12000	0.003292	0.002939	0.007316	54.99	59.82
8000	-12000	0.003362	0.002961	0.007238	55.21	59.10
12000	-12000	0.002371	0.002108	0.007968	42.79	44.08
16000	-12000	0.001433	0.001187	0.006603	-137.61	-96.75
20000	-12000	0.001413	0.001187	0.005110	4.48	21.36
24000	-12000	0.001435	0.001426	0.001714	-1.24	16.80
-24000	-8000	0.001735	0.001503	0.007700	26.50	44.32
-20000	-8000	0.001985	0.001503	0.007986	43.78	58.36
-16000	-8000	0.003365	0.002493	0.011066	68.41	76.92
-12000	-8000	0.004443	0.003246	0.011066	68.41	76.92
-8000	-8000	0.010417	0.008091	0.026427	60.57	87.38
-4000	-8000	0.012104	0.009057	0.043877	73.62	90.76
0	-8000	0.004932	0.004932	0.018508	66.20	72.91
4000	-8000	0.005442	0.004337	0.012210	55.53	60.39
8000	-8000	0.003785	0.004279	0.008266	54.32	58.62
12000	-8000	0.003199	0.003270	0.010193	65.33	66.99
16000	-8000	0.001639	0.001362	0.007437	51.14	56.08
20000	-8000	0.002436	0.002143	0.001663	-129.18	-101.56
24000	-8000	0.002484	0.002154	0.001160	-116.08	-85.64
-24000	-4000	0.002646	0.002174	0.001718	-53.48	-28.38
-20000	-4000	0.003077	0.002499	0.008026	-52.01	-18.99
-16000	-4000	0.003544	0.002670	0.009517	31.36	48.42
-12000	-4000	0.006237	0.004228	0.018469	66.23	77.11
-8000	-4000	0.008378	0.013825	0.079817	26.98	83.68
-4000	-4000	0.011597	0.008943	0.056410	29.44	86.11
0	-4000	0.008398	0.007391	0.028786	70.13	76.32
4000	-4000	0.007441	0.006264	0.016267	65.59	70.84
8000	-4000	0.005321	0.004644	0.011484	52.69	60.29
12000	-4000	0.004380	0.003754	0.008369	54.11	56.93
16000	-4000	0.003368	0.002735	0.007273	54.34	60.03
20000	-4000	0.002385	0.002244	0.001217	-96.06	-68.49
24000	-4000	0.000995	0.000790	0.002180	-69.62	-78.61
-24000	0	0.000995	0.000790	0.002180	-79.76	-45.24
-20000	0	0.003533	0.003616	0.002189	-36.42	-18.18
-16000	0	0.005533	0.005001	0.003375	-36.42	-70.85
-12000	0	0.008732	0.007736	0.006401	-36.42	-70.85
-8000	0	0.011554	0.009552	0.020957	16.55	26.63





- . The largest absolute differences and larger percentage differences occur at the receptor locations nearest the source.
- . The smallest absolute differences and largest percentage differences tend to occur near the grid perimeter.
- . 98 percent of the receptor grid concentrations resulting from virtual source assumptions fall within the same order of magnitude as those resulting from elevated source assumptions.
- . The taller stack always yields marginally higher resultant concentrations than the shorter (intermediate) stack. This would not generally be the case but can in this instance be attributed to the higher buoyancy and plume rise of the shorter stack.

The changes in the dispersion footprint are only one aspect of the effect of the modelling inputs on the benefits estimates. The other critical factor is how the changes in estimated concentrations are distributed in relation to the population. These effects are analysed in the next two chapters.

### 3.0 SULPHUR DIOXIDE

Sulphur dioxide causes respiratory problems, is phytotoxic, causes materials damage, and can reduce visibility.

Exposure-response functions for sulphur dioxide are provided in Appendix B with respect to:

- . mortality;
- . hospital days for respiratory conditions; and
- . hospital admissions for respiratory disease.

#### 3.1 Previous Results

Reductions in mortality estimated to result from lower concentrations of sulphur dioxide attributable to implementation of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 are as follows:

	<u>Reduced Mortality Deaths/Year</u>	<u>Range of Economic Benefits/Year (1986 C\$)</u>
Scenarios <sup>17</sup> "A" & "D"	250	\$550 - 1,738 million
Scenario "B"	300	\$660 - 2,085 million
Scenario "C"	97	\$213 - 674 million
Scenario "E"	97	\$213 - 674 million

---

<sup>17</sup> The scenarios are defined in Appendix C.

The estimated benefits of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 in the form of reduced hospitalization due to lower sulphur dioxide concentrations are as follows:

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduction in Hospital Days for Respiratory Conditions	3,746	4,495	1,458	1,458
Reduction in Hospital Admissions for Respiratory Disease	381	457	148	148
Value (million 1986 C\$)				
. Low <sup>18</sup>	\$ 2.5	\$ 3.0	\$ 1.0	\$ 1.0
. Central <sup>18</sup>	\$ 8.7	\$ 10.4	\$ 3.4	\$ 3.4

### 3.2 Revisions to Previous Results

A review of the derivation of the exposure-response function led to a change in the coefficient for the sulphur dioxide mortality equation from  $2.672 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $1.670 \times 10^{-5}$ . The corrected exposure response function is shown in Appendix B.

Minor computational errors were also uncovered that affected all three exposure response functions. These were corrected.

Revised results were calculated using the estimated emissions and the same dispersion footprints used in the Public Benefits study for all sulphur dioxide sources. The revised results are as shown below.

---

<sup>18</sup> Low and central refer to the economic values assigned to various categories of benefits, see Section 3.11 and Appendix A of The DPA Group Inc., Estimated Public Benefits of Implementing the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, September, 1988.



	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	240	296	81	82
Reduction in Hospital Days for Respiratory Conditions	5,745	7,083	1,936	1,955
Reduction in Hospital Admissions for Respiratory Disease	584	720	197	199
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>19</sup>	\$ 528 - \$1,667	\$ 651 - \$2,055	\$ 178 - \$ 562	\$ 180 - \$ 567
Value of Non-Lethal Health Benefits (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>19</sup>	\$4 - \$13	\$5 - \$16	\$1 - \$5	\$1 - \$5

These results were calculated in exactly the same manner as those presented in the report on the earlier study. The differences are due entirely to correction of the computational error and revision of the mortality exposure-response function.

### 3.3 Sample Estimation of Benefits

The above benefits were also estimated using the stratified sample of 19 sulphur dioxide sources. These results are calculated using the estimated emissions and the deposition footprints used in the Public Benefits study. The only difference is that these results are estimated using the stratified sample of 19 sources rather than the entire population of 177 sources. The analysis serves as an indicator of how well the stratified sample matches the population totals. The results are shown below:

---

<sup>19</sup> The range reflects the low and central values of the economic benefits.

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	233	289	41	39
Reduction in Hospital Days for Respiratory Conditions	5,586	6,932	971	942
Reduction in Hospital Admissions for Respiratory Disease	568	704	99	96
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>20</sup>	\$ 513 - \$1,621	\$ 637 - \$2,011	\$ 89 - \$ 282	\$ 87 - \$ 273
Value of Non-Lethal Health Benefits (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>20</sup>	\$4 - \$13	\$5 - \$16	\$1 - \$2	\$1 - \$2

The stratified sample provides estimates of benefits which are very close to those obtained using the population totals for Scenarios A&D and B, being within 3 percent of the total in each case.

The sample estimates for Scenarios C and E are approximately half the population totals. The establishments selected for the sample are from industries where the reductions in emissions under Scenarios C and E are smaller than those anticipated for sulphur dioxide emissions generally.

### 3.4 Impact of the Revised Deposition Footprints

The next step in the analysis is to estimate the above benefits for the stratified sample of 19 sulphur dioxide sources using the estimated emissions and the new

---

<sup>20</sup> The range reflects the low and central values of the economic benefits.

source-specific deposition footprints. This isolates the impact of the assumptions used in the deposition modelling. The results are presented below.

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	54	62	11	11
Reduction in Hospital Days for Respiratory Conditions	1,300	1,491	256	259
Reduction in Hospital Admissions for Respiratory Disease	132	151	26	26
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>21</sup>	\$ 119 - \$ 377	\$ 137 - \$ 432	\$ 23 - \$ 74	\$ 24 - \$ 75
Value of Non-Lethal Health Benefits (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>21</sup>	\$1 - \$3	\$1 - \$3	< \$1	< \$1

Changing the deposition modelling assumptions has a significant impact on the results. The benefits obtained using source specific stack and emissions characteristics are roughly one-quarter as large as those obtained using the assumption that all sources have the same characteristics.

This comparison overstates the effect of using more accurate stack data by an unknown amount. Previously all sources were virtual (building) sources. Using actual stack characteristics, significant quantities of sulphur dioxide are emitted from stacks higher than 30 m. A larger, but unknown, fraction of the emissions from higher stacks are deposited outside the model deposition area. Since a smaller fraction of the emissions fall within the modelled footprint, the difference

---

<sup>21</sup> The range reflects the low and central values of the economic benefits.

between the previous estimates and the estimates based on actual stack data are overstated.

### 3.5 Impact of Using Actual Emissions Data

The actual emissions for the 19 sulphur dioxide sources in the sample total 53,500 tonnes per year. The emissions estimated for these sources totalled 50,078 tonnes per year. The total estimated for all sources that would be affected by the revisions to Regulation 308 is 87,995 tonnes per year. This total is assumed to be correct.

The benefits are calculated for the 19 sample sources using the actual emissions and the source specific stack and emissions characteristics. Those results are scaled up to the total emissions of 87,995 tonnes per year. When compared with the results presented above, this analysis isolates the effect of using actual vs. estimated emissions. The results are presented below.

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	56	70	19	19
Reduction in Hospital Days for Respiratory Conditions	1,341	1,686	448	460
Reduction in Hospital Admissions for Respiratory Disease	136	171	45	47
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>22</sup>	\$ 123 - \$ 389	\$ 155 - \$ 489	\$ 41 - \$ 130	\$ 42 - \$ 134

---

<sup>22</sup> The range reflects the low and central values of the economic benefits.

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Value of Non-Lethal Health Benefits (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>22</sup>	\$1 - \$3	\$1 - \$4	< \$1	< \$1

The impact of using actual emissions is to raise the estimated benefits under all scenarios. The increase is small (less than 5%) for Scenarios A&D, in the range of 10-15 percent for Scenario B and of the order of 75 percent for Scenarios C and E.

The public benefits estimated using the sample sources with their actual emissions and source specific stack and emissions characteristics are slightly less than one-quarter of the revised results (presented in Section 3.2) obtained using the procedures and assumptions of the Public Benefits study.

These calculations also compare the revised deposition footprints with those previously used. And since the revised footprints capture a smaller share of the total emissions, the differences are overstated to an unknown extent.

### 3.6 Threshold Exceedances of Sulphur Dioxide Concentrations

The Public Benefits study reported areas and populations estimated to be exposed to above threshold concentrations of sulphur dioxide. Those above threshold exposures are presumed to pose risks for both human health and plant life and the revisions to Regulation 308 propose to restrict concentrations to below threshold levels. The areas and population exposed were estimated. But specific health and crop impacts of those above threshold exposures could not be determined due to the lack of appropriate above threshold exposure-response

functions. Consequently, the benefits of reduced exposures also could not be determined or valued.

The use of a sample of sulphur dioxide emission sources does not allow the exposure calculations to be repeated in a meaningful way. That calculation requires that the dispersion patterns of all sources be combined so that the total ambient concentration at each point can be computed. Mixing the dispersion data for sample sources, calculated with actual emissions and actual stack characteristics, with those of the remaining sources, calculated with estimated emissions and assumed stack characteristics, is not meaningful.

## **4.0 SUSPENDED PARTICULATE MATTER**

Suspended particulate matter causes respiratory problems, damages materials and reduces visibility.

Exposure-response functions for suspended particulate matter are available for:

- . mortality;
- . restricted activity days;
- . emergency room visits;
- . materials damage; and
- . visibility.

These functions are described in Appendix B. As discussed in Section 4.6, the visibility function takes a form that can not be calculated on a sample basis and extrapolated to the population. Hence, the visibility benefits are not addressed in the following sections.

### **4.1 Previous Results**

Reductions in mortality estimated to result from lower concentrations of suspended particulate matter attributable to implementation to the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 are estimated as follows:



	Reduced Mortality Deaths/Year	Range of Economic Benefits/Year (1986 C\$)
Scenarios <sup>23</sup> "A" & "D"	50	\$110 - 348 million
Scenario "B"	54	\$119 - 375 million
Scenario "C"	25	\$ 55 - 174 million
Scenario "E"	36	\$ 79 - 250 million

The benefits of implementing the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 in the form of lower restricted activity days and emergency room visits due to reduced particulate matter concentrations are estimated to be as follows:

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduction in Emergency Room Visits	2,940	3,189	1,492	2,116
Reduction in Restricted Activity Days	616,000	668,000	313,000	443,000
Value (million 1986 C\$)				
. Low <sup>24</sup>	\$ 6.6	\$ 7.2	\$ 3.4	\$ 4.7
. Central <sup>24</sup>	\$ 37.7	\$ 40.9	\$ 19.2	\$ 27.1

The reduced materials damage estimated to result from lower concentrations of particulate matter attributable to implementation of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 is as follows:

---

<sup>23</sup> The scenarios are defined in Appendix C.

<sup>24</sup> Low and central refer to the economic values assigned to various categories of benefits, see Section 3.11 and Appendix A of The DPA Group Inc., Estimated Public Benefits of Implementing the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, September, 1988.

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduction in Materials Damage (million 1986 C\$)				
. Low <sup>25</sup>	\$ 5.8	\$ 6.3	\$ 3.0	\$ 4.2
. Central <sup>25</sup>	\$ 83.0	\$ 90.0	\$ 42.1	\$ 59.8

The foregoing results replicate the calculations reported in the earlier study. They are identical to those reported in that study with the exception of a few changes due to rounding resulting from the greater precision adopted in the current calculations.

## 4.2 Sample Estimation of Benefits

The above benefits were also estimated using the stratified sample of 29 particulate matter sources. These results are calculated using the estimated emissions and the deposition footprints used in the previous study. The analysis measures how well the stratified sample matches the population totals. The results are shown below.

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	86	90	49	72
Reduction in Emergency Room Visits	5,034	5,276	2,873	4,235
Reduction in Restricted Activity Days	1,055,000	1,105,000	602,000	887,000

<sup>25</sup> Low and central refer to the economic values assigned to various categories of benefits, see Section 3.11 and Appendix A of The DPA Group Inc., Estimated Public Benefits of Implementing the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, September, 1988.

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>26</sup>	\$ 189 - \$ 598	\$ 198 - \$ 626	\$ 108 - \$ 341	\$ 158 - \$ 500
Value of Non-Lethal Health Impacts (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>26</sup>	\$ 9 - \$ 65	\$ 12 - \$ 68	\$ 6 - \$ 37	\$ 10 - \$ 54
Reduced Materials Damage (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>26</sup>	\$ 10 - \$ 142	\$ 10 - \$ 149	\$ 6 - \$ 81	\$ 8 - \$ 120

The estimates derived from the stratified sample are 65 to 100 percent higher than those based on the population. The difference between the benefits estimated using the stratified sample and those estimated using the entire population of 1,091 sources is largest for Scenarios C and E. Since all of the sample estimates exceed the population figures, it suggests that the sample sources tend to have larger populations within their dispersion areas than is the case for particulate matter sources generally.

The comparison suggests that the establishments in the sample are from industries where the reductions in emissions under Scenarios C and E are smaller than those for particulate matter generally. That was also true of the sulphur dioxide sample. Since the sulphur dioxide sample represents two-thirds of the particulate matter sample it is not so surprising that it is also true for particulates.

---

<sup>26</sup> The range reflects the low and central values of the economic benefits.

### 4.3 Impact of the Revised Deposition Footprints

Next, the benefits of reduced particulate emissions are estimated using the stratified sample of 29 sources and their specific deposition footprints, but still using the estimated emissions. This isolates the impact of the assumptions used in the deposition modelling. The results are presented below.

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	25	25	18	24
Reduction in Emergency Room Visits	1,463	1,485	1,045	1,391
Reduction in Restricted Activity Days	306,500	311,000	219,000	291,000
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>27</sup>	\$ 55 - \$ 174	\$ 55 - \$ 174	\$ 40 - \$ 125	\$ 53 - \$ 167
Value of Non-Lethal Health Impacts (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>27</sup>	\$ 3 - \$ 19	\$ 3 - \$ 19	\$ 2 - \$ 13	\$ 3 - \$ 18
Reduced Materials Damage (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>27</sup>	\$ 3 - \$ 41	\$ 3 - \$ 42	\$ 2 - \$ 30	\$ 3 - \$ 40

As was the case for the sulphur dioxide sample, changing the deposition modelling assumptions has a significant impact on the results. The benefits estimated using the source specific stack and emissions characteristics are roughly one-third as

---

<sup>27</sup> The range reflects the low and central values of the economic benefits.

large as those calculated using the assumption that all sources have the same characteristics.

This comparison overstates the effect of using more accurate stack data by an unknown amount. Previously all sources were virtual (building) sources. Using actual stack characteristics, significant quantities of particulates are emitted from stacks higher than 30 m. A larger, but unknown, fraction of the emissions from higher stacks are deposited outside the model deposition area. Since a smaller fraction of the emissions fall within the modelled footprint, the difference between the previous estimates and the estimates based on actual stack data are overstated.

#### **4.4 Impact of Using Actual Emissions Data**

The actual emissions of particulate matter for the 29 sources in the sample are 17,417 tonnes per year. The emissions estimated for those sources totalled 29,896 tonnes per year. Total particulate matter emissions estimated for all sources that would be affected by the revisions to Regulation 308 amount to 92,208 tonnes per year. This total is assumed to be correct. This assumption is discussed further below.

The benefits are calculated for the 29 sample sources using the actual emissions and the source specific deposition patterns. Those results are scaled up to the total emissions of 92,208 tonnes per year. When compared with the results presented above, this analysis isolates the effect of using actual vs. estimated emissions. The results are presented below.

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	11	12	5	8
Reduction in Emergency Room Visits	637	681	321	492
Reduction in Restricted Activity Days	133,500	142,500	67,000	103,000
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>28</sup>	\$ 24 - \$ 76	\$ 26 - \$ 83	\$ 11 - \$ 35	\$ 18 - \$ 56
Value of Non-Lethal Health Impacts (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>28</sup>	\$ 1 - \$ 8	\$ 2 - \$ 9	\$ 1 - \$ 4	\$ 1 - \$ 6
Reduced Materials Damage (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>28</sup>	\$ 1 - \$ 18	\$ 1 - \$ 19	\$ 1 - \$ 9	\$ 1 - \$ 14

The impact of using actual emissions is to reduce the estimated benefits between 45 and 70 percent depending upon the scenario. This contrasts with the sulphur dioxide sample, where the effect of using actual emissions was to raise the benefits estimates.

It should be noted that the analysis assumes that the estimate of total emissions by all sources that would be affected by the revisions to Regulation 308 is correct. In the case of sulphur dioxide that actual emissions of the sample sources was about 7 percent higher than the estimated emissions for those sources. Using the sample data to estimate a new population total, rather than assuming that the estimated population total is correct would make relatively little difference.

---

<sup>28</sup> The range reflects the low and central values of the economic benefits.

In the case of particulate matter, the actual emissions of the 29 sample sources amount to only 58 percent of the estimated emissions of those sources. Using the sample data to estimate a new population total, rather than assuming that the estimate population total is correct could have a more significant impact on the benefits estimates.

The public benefits estimated using the sample sources with their actual emissions and source specific stack and emissions characteristics are slightly less than one-quarter of the results obtained using the procedures and assumptions of the Public Benefits study.

These calculations also compare the revised deposition footprints with those previously used. And since the revised footprints capture a smaller share of the total emissions, the differences are overstated to an unknown extent.

The ratio of the public benefits estimated using the sample sources with their actual emissions and source specific stack and emissions characteristics to the public benefits estimated in the Public Benefits study is the same for all scenarios. Coincidentally, it is virtually identical to the relationship that was found for sulphur dioxide. We believe that to be a coincidence rather than a fundamental pattern. It may be due to the extensive overlap between the sulphur dioxide and particulate matter samples.

#### **4.5 Threshold Exceedances of Particulate Matter Concentrations**

The earlier study reported areas and populations estimated to be exposed to above threshold concentrations of particulate matter. Those above threshold exposures are presumed to pose risks for human health. Specific health benefits due to reduced exposures to above threshold concentrations were not determined due to the lack of appropriate exposure-response functions.



The use of a sample of particulate matter sources does not allow the above threshold exposure calculations to be repeated in a meaningful way. That calculation requires that the dispersion patterns of all sources be combined so that the total ambient concentration at each point can be computed. Mixing the dispersion data for sample sources, calculated with actual emissions and actual stack characteristics, with those of the remaining sources, calculated with estimated emissions and assumed stack characteristics, is not meaningful.

#### **4.6 Impacts on Visibility**

The exposure-response function for visibility (see Appendix B) depends upon the ratio of the particulate matter concentration; the current concentration divided by the estimated concentration after the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 have been implemented. To apply this equation, it is necessary to have the total particulate matter concentration at each point before and after implementation of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308.

Using the sample yields particulate matter concentrations from those sources alone, not the total particulate matter concentration from all sources. The ratio of the before and after concentrations is therefore incorrect. Hence, the impact of the procedures and assumptions used in the previous study on the visibility benefit could not be assessed.

In the process of investigating this question it became apparent that the visibility benefit reported previously is probably significantly overstated. The exposure-response function gives the greatest weight to areas that experience the largest proportional reduction in particulate matter concentration. We found that large proportional reductions often occurred in grid cells where existing particulate matter concentrations were low. The proposed revisions to Regulation 308

reduced these low concentrations significantly, producing large proportional changes and correspondingly large benefits for improved visibility. However, the existing concentrations are so low that it must be questioned whether visibility is hampered at present and consequently whether an improvement can be noticed.

We found no threshold concentrations or other information in the literature that would permit us to adjust the exposure-response function for visibility. We recommend that the estimated visibility benefits for particulate matter be dropped from the analysis.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

An earlier study for the Ministry identified the air quality, health and environmental benefits expected from implementation of proposed revisions to Regulation 308.<sup>29</sup> That study had to overcome data limitations and methodological issues within tight deadlines. The results were qualified as broad approximations that provide a rough indication of the nature and magnitude of the public benefits of the proposed revisions.

Overall sulphur dioxide and particulate matter accounted for 40 to 50 percent of the estimated benefits that could be quantified. This report examined the impacts of using more accurate stack data and actual emissions instead of estimated emissions on the estimates of the public benefits associated with sulphur dioxide and particulate matter.

### 5.1 Revised Results

Using stack characteristics and actual emissions for a sample of sources and extrapolating to the population total produces the following estimates of the annual public benefits associated with the proposed revisions to Regulation 308.

---

<sup>29</sup> The DPA Group Inc., Estimated Public Benefits of Implementing the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, September, 1988.

### SULPHUR DIOXIDE

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	56	70	19	19
Reduction in Hospital Days for Respiratory Conditions	1,341	1,686	448	460
Reduction in Hospital Admissions for Respiratory Disease	36	171	45	47
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>30</sup>	\$ 123 - \$ 389	\$ 155 - \$ 489	\$ 41 - \$ 130	\$ 42 - \$ 134
Value of Non-Lethal Health Benefits (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>29</sup>	\$1 - \$3	\$1 - \$4	< \$1	< \$1

### PARTICULATE MATTER

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Mortality (Deaths/year)	11	12	5	8
Reduction in Emergency Room Visits	637	681	321	492
Reduction in Restricted Activity Days	133,500	142,500	67,000	103,000
Value of Reduced Mortality (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>29</sup>	\$ 24 - \$ 76	\$ 26 - \$ 83	\$ 11 - \$ 35	\$ 18 - \$ 56
Value of Non-Lethal Health Impacts (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>29</sup>	\$1 - \$8	\$2 - \$9	\$1 - \$4	\$1 - \$6

---

<sup>30</sup> The range reflects the low and central values of the economic benefits.

	Scenarios "A" & "D"	Scenario "B"	Scenario "C"	Scenario "E"
Reduced Materials Damage (millions of 1986 \$) <sup>29</sup>	\$1 - \$18	\$1 - \$19	\$1 - \$9	\$1 - \$14

These estimates are generally 20 to 25 percent of the values presented in the previous report.<sup>31</sup>

Some unknown fraction of the emissions of each source are deposited outside the 25 km radius area covered by the dispersion model. Those emissions are lost to the benefit calculation, so the benefits are understated. Using actual stack characteristics raises the fraction of the emissions deposited outside the 25 km radius area by an unknown degree. This understates the benefits further and overstates the difference between the results reported in the previous study and those calculated using actual stack and emissions data.

The exposure-response function for the visibility effects of particulate matter could not be applied on a sample basis. Investigation found that it imputed large benefits to areas where proportional reductions in particulate were large, but where existing concentrations were already quite small. In our judgement it is not apparent that visibility improvements could be noticed in all of these areas. We recommend that the estimated visibility benefits for particulate matter be dropped from the analysis.

The earlier study reported areas and populations estimated to be exposed to above threshold concentrations of particulate matter and sulphur dioxide. The use of a

---

<sup>31</sup> The estimates presented in the Public Benefits report are reproduced in Sections 3.1 and 4.1 of this report.

sample of sulphur dioxide or particulate matter sources does not allow the above threshold calculations to be repeated in a meaningful way.

## 5.2 Interpretation of the Results

The revised results should still be interpreted as being broad approximations, that provide a rough indication of the nature and magnitude of the public benefits attributable to implementation of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308.

In the analysis of the environmental impacts:

- . accurate actual data are preferred to estimates; and
- . larger samples are preferred to smaller samples.

These propositions remain true. The results presented above do not reflect accurate actual data for, nor complete coverage of, all sources and so could be refined still further. However, the data collection and analytical effort involved is large.

The revised results presented above focused on the dispersion modelling aspects of the analysis. If further refinements are considered it may be appropriate to address other factors that could affect the results, for example:

- . source specific estimates of the reduction of emissions that could be achieved under each implementation scenario. The above analysis uses industry averages for all plants.
- . finer resolution of the population distribution data so that greater resolution of the dispersion modelling could be meaningfully applied.

- . more and better exposure-response functions so that more of the impacts can be quantified with a degree of confidence.
- . analysis of fluctuations in emissions and the impacts of short term exposures rather than annual averages.

The revised results remain a useful first approximation of the public benefits of the proposed revisions to Regulation 308.

### **5.3 Exposure-Response Functions**

The review of the exposure-response functions for sulphur dioxide and particulate matter led to two unresolved epidemiological debates.

First, is the issue of thresholds. Threshold concentrations are the only feasible way to regulate contaminants. The threshold established is generally a conservative one. A no observed adverse effect limit (NOAEL) is established using toxicological data and a series of protection or safety factors. The result is then multiplied by a final protection factor (usually 0.1) to protect the most-sensitive population groups. The regulatory thresholds are, therefore, considered by many to be conservative and to offer a high degree of protection for human health.

Nevertheless, epidemiologists we consulted felt that reduced exposures yield health benefits even if the concentrations are below accepted thresholds. In other words, while exposures to below threshold concentrations may be deemed to be "safe" on the basis of current medical knowledge, lower concentrations may still yield health benefits.



Second, is the apparently conflicting evidence of micro- and macro-epidemiological studies. The former are medical studies of relatively small, controlled groups of subjects exposed to different concentrations of contaminants. The latter are statistical analyses of air pollution and human health data for large populations. The micro studies tend to show no direct health problems associated with air pollution levels below current standards. The macro studies show weak but statistically significant relationships between current air pollution levels and human health.

It is worth noting that the coefficients for the health impacts imply that only one person in 10,000 is affected. The micro-epidemiological studies generally deal with smaller groups. This might help to explain the apparent contradiction in the findings of the different types of studies.

The macro studies, by the nature of the statistical techniques used, can not identify cause and effect. The macro studies also can not ensure that the estimated effects are not due to causes that have been overlooked in the analysis. For example, the observed health effects could be due to the combined impact of sulphur dioxide and particulate matter rather than particulate matter alone. The study from which the sulphur dioxide exposure-response function is drawn considered that interaction, but may have done so inadequately or may have omitted other important factors.

This study uses exposure-response functions derived from macro-epidemiological studies. And it assumes that health and other benefits occur at below threshold concentrations. Further, the exposure-response functions are assumed to be linear and to be independent for each contaminant.<sup>32</sup> If, contrary to these assumptions,

---

<sup>32</sup> Although it is not directly relevant for sulphur dioxide or particulates, the exposure-response functions for carcinogens are generally agreed to be linear with a zero threshold. However, the unit risk factors used to define those linear relationships are developed in

benefits can be realized only above some threshold level, then the benefits will be somewhat smaller than the estimates presented.

This study estimates benefits from changes in annual average exposures. Reductions in peak exposures may be more critical for some benefits. Very few exposure-response functions use peak concentrations as the basis for estimating benefits. And to compute the changes in peak concentrations using the dispersion model involves a significant increase in effort. As a result benefits were not related to shorter term exposures. This was, however, one of several possible refinements suggested in the earlier study.

---

much the same way as the threshold values, and so may overstate the benefits of reduced concentrations of carcinogens.

## REFERENCES

Evans, J.S., T. Tosteson, and P.L. Kinney. "Cross-Sectional Mortality Studies and Air Pollution Risk Assessment." Environmental International, (10) pp. 55-83, 1984.

Mazumdar, S., H. Schimmel, and I.T.T. Higgins. "Relationship of Daily Mortality to Air Pollution: An Analysis of 14 London Winters, 1958/59-1971/72." Archives of Environmental Health. (38) pp. 213-220, 1982.

Ostro, B.D. "A Search For a Threshold in the Relationship of Air Pollution to Mortality: A Reanalysis of London Winters." Environmental Health Perspectives. (58) pp. 397-399, 1984.

Ostro, B.D. "Air Pollution and Morbidity Revisited: A Specification Test." Journal of Environmental Economics and Management. (14) pp. 87-98.

Ostro, B.D. "The Effects of Air Pollution on Work Loss and Morbidity." Journal of Environmental Economics and Management. (10) pp. 371-382, 1983.

Ostro, B.D. Presentation to the EPA Clean Air Science Advisory Committee. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. December 1985.

Plagiannakos, T. and J. Parker. "An Assessment of Air Pollution Effects on Human Health in Ontario." Economics and Forecasts Division, Ontario Hydro, File No.: 706.01 (#260), 1988.

Samet, J.M., Y. Bishop, R.E. Speizer, J.D. Spengler, and B.G. Ferris. "The Relationship Between Air Pollution and Emergency Room Visits in an Industrial Community." Journal of the Air Pollution Control Association. (31) pp. 236-40, 1981.

Schwartz, J.S. and A. Marcus. "Statistical Reanalysis of Data Relating Mortality to Air Pollution During London Winters 1958-1972." Working Paper, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC, 1986.

Senes Consultants Ltd., Estimation of Additional Abatement Costs for the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308, forthcoming.

The DPA Group Inc., Estimated Public Benefits of Implementing the Proposed Revisions to Regulation 308. Ontario Ministry of the Environment. September, 1988.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Dispersion Modelling of Selected Sources Of SO<sub>2</sub> Particulate**

## A.1 INTRODUCTION

This study performed detailed dispersion modelling on a statistically representative selection of sources of SO<sub>2</sub> and particulate matter. The purpose of the work was to analyse the effect of using actual source characteristics rather than standard assumptions of a virtual source on the benefits estimated in an earlier study.

**The Public Benefits study concluded that the most significant measurable benefits of implementing proposed changes to Regulation 308 would be expected to be attributed to reductions in emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> and particulate matter.**

Since nearly all significant sources of SO<sub>2</sub> and many major sources of particulate matter in Ontario emit from **elevated** sources, it appeared to be desirable to assess the impact of the assumption used in the Public Benefits study that all sources are virtual sources. This, in addition to other considerations, led to the current study.

## A.2 BACKGROUND

In the previous study, a typical source was defined and modelled for each meteorological area (met-zone) of the Province. This yielded 48 x 48 km dispersion concentration "footprints" per g/s emitted. Footprints for each met-zone were spatially mapped, scaled, and superimposed to correspond to coordinates and estimated emission rates for source establishments (plants). Project scheduling, scope, and data availability at that time did not allow for actual source parameters to be used in the modelling. Since about 95% of the source plants in the province emit under virtual-source conditions, a typical virtual source was defined to be a building of 7 m height, 100 m width, and 7 m stack elevation

above the building. It was intended that the enhanced building width in this definition of typical would offset to some degree the variability in actual building heights.

Modelling was performed on a 2 km-resolution receptor grid with near-source resolution increased to 500 m and 1,000 m. Since the largest discrepancies between modelled and actual concentrations would be expected to occur inside a 2-3 km radius of an **elevated** source (~5% of the sources in Ontario), some additional approximations were suggested to offset artificially enhanced concentrations near the source.

In the benefits analysis of the study, the decision was made to reduce modelled resolution to 4 km on a 48 x 48 km grid. This coincided with the best grid resolution for which population and establishment distribution data were available and also resulted in reducing the discrepancies between modelled and actual concentrations for the 5% of sources which were elevated.

### **A.3 DATA SOURCES AND CONSOLIDATION OF STACK TYPES**

Actual stack characteristics were provided by the MOE and developed for the final selection of 29 sources of SO<sub>2</sub> and/or particulate matter. The selected plants presented a combined total of 265 individual stacks. As a response to the logistics of modelling 265 sources with different apportionments of emissions for SO<sub>2</sub> and particulate, a data reduction process was developed with the concurrence of the MOE Model Development Unit. The object here was to reduce the number of sources to a manageable number while maintaining a good representation of emission types and apportionments (i.e., among high elevated, moderately elevated, low elevated, and virtual sources at a plant).



Since no MOE data were available on building dimensions, a reasonable assumption of these dimensions was required. A typical virtual source was defined as one of 14 m height, 50 m width, and stack elevation less than 28 m. Thus effectively, stacks of less than about 30 m elevation would be considered virtual sources. Note that the building height chosen was exactly double, and the width one-half of that chosen in the previous study. This simplified comparison with the previous effort, and provide additional information on the sensitivity of the dispersion field to building dimensions.

Using the new definition of a typical building reduced the number of required model runs to 160. Remaining stacks were grouped (per plant) according to characteristics (e.g., height, temperature, contribution to total plant emissions, etc.) and emissions pooled accordingly. In addition, emissions from "stray stacks", those contributing less than 7% of total plant emissions, were distributed among the remaining most-similar stacks or virtual sources. Using a common definition of building source also allowed some model runs from common met-zones (e.g., Toronto) to be combined.

The resultant selection of 49 sources to be modelled (for 29 plants) yielded 40 model runs. The relevant data for these 29 plants (49 sources) is presented in Exhibit A.1.

## **A.4 MODEL RUNS**

The meteorology developed previously was used in the present study. Receptor grid resolution was set at 4 km on a 24 x 24 km grid to correspond with the resolution used previously and to facilitate the subsequent benefits analysis.

# EXHIBIT A.1: SO<sub>2</sub> AND PARTICULATE SOURCES DATA SUMMARY

PLANT NAME	CITY	FILE NAME	TOTAL SO <sub>2</sub> (MT/YR)	TOTAL PARTIC. (MT/YR)	TOTAL NO. OF ELEV. STKS.	TOTAL NO. OF VERT. STKS.	SO <sub>2</sub> PER STK. (MT/YR)	PARTIC. PER STK. (MT/YR)	N-SO <sub>2</sub> FRACTION (g/g-normalized)	N-SO <sub>2</sub> FRACTION	STACK HEIGHT (m)	EXIT VELOC. (m/s)	STACK RADIUS (m)	EXIT TDAP. (m/s)	SAMPLE SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
1 AGTIBI PAPER (PND)	THUNDER BAY	THU THU	3.0	224.0	3	1	1	0.1	90.3	0.033	34.25	6.48	1.79	307	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
							0	2.9	133.7	0.967	14.00	0.00	0.30	-999	Pct.
2 * ATLANTIC PACKAGING	SCARBOROUGH	TOR	0.5	39.6	3	0	1	0	0.3	19.6	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
3 * BEAVER WOOD FIBRE	THOROLD	SIM	1.2	1.1	2	2	0	1	1.2	1.1	30.00	15.69	0.45	366	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
4 BROCKTON (INTROCHEM)	MATLAND	KIN KIN	61.9	91.0	6	2	1	5	0.0	90.5	41.00	8.36	1.20	373	Pct.
							0	61.9	2.5	1.000	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	Pct.
5 C-H-L	COURTMOUNT	WIN WIN	113.4	365.3	13	8	1	1	66.0	21.1	32.00	21.70	1.50	472	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
							0	47.4	344.4	0.418	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	Pct.
6 CAN-CEMENT LAFARGE	NR BATH	KIN KIN	1710.0	390.1	14	11	0	7	0.0	195.7	46.00	30.70	0.75	358	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
							9	1710.0	194.4	1.000	76.00	8.60	1.55	479	Pct.
7 * CANADA METAL CO LTD	TORONTO	TOR TOR	715.2	81.6	8	1	1	2	715.2	63.9	46.00	31.36	0.90	332	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
							0	0.0	15.7	0.000	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	Pct.
8 * DOWFASCO INC.	HAMILTON	TOR TOR	6125.7	1642.5	9	6	1	3	1802.6	5.6	44.00	5.09	3.05	477	Pct.
							9	2452.7	526.3	0.400	69.00	11.75	1.45	450	Pct.
							0	1870.4	1110.4	0.305	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	Pct.
9 DOMSTAR PAPER LTD	RED ROCK	TOR TOR	647.3	2192.4	1	1	0	1	647.3	2392.4	50.00	3.00	0.45	366	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
10 EDDY FOREST PROD.	ESPANOLA	SOO SOO	1379.5	2659.7	4	4	0	1	1376.6	1994.2	77.00	13.91	1.83	477	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
							2	52.9	661.6	0.038	31.00	5.60	0.92	341	Pct.
11 FED. WHITE CEMENT	WOODSTOCK	LON LON	552.8	23.4	6	2	1	2	152.5	7.3	32.50	0.30	0.92	573	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
							0	400.3	16.1	0.724	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	Pct.
12 GREAT LAKES FOREST	THUNDER BAY	THU THU	2888.3	1674.3	3	3	0	1	1157.1	1.9	61.26	3.10	1.98	422	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
							2	1701.2	1622.4	0.595	50.00	7.25	1.22	373	Pct.
13 OULFETRICAN CLARKSON	MISSISSAUGA	TOR TOR	4817.8	389.0	26	11	1	20	2394.1	63.4	70.00	10.70	1.05	386	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
							22	1881.7	294.9	0.390	31.00	34.80	1.05	481	Pct.
							0	532.0	507.7	0.110	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	Pct.
14 IMPERIAL OIL	SARNIA	WIN WIN	19595	154.0	12	12	1	7	16662.3	114.0	91.00	11.20	1.60	617	SO <sub>2</sub> Pct.
							0	2928.1	38.0	0.149	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	Pct.
15 INDOLOY LTD	NORTH YORK	TOR	0.2	10.3	2	0	1	0	0.2	10.3	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	Pct.
16 KIDD CREEK MINES	TRAMERS	TIM TIM	4272.2	185.8	6	3	0	4	2716.1	60.7	43.00	27.70	0.61	535	Pct.
							5	1497.1	123.1	0.652	74.00	16.00	0.86	560	Pct.

# EXHIBIT A.1: SO<sub>2</sub> AND PARTICULATE SOURCES DATA SUMMARY (Continued)

PLANT NAME	CITY	FILE NAME	TOTAL SO <sub>2</sub> PARTIC. (MT/Yr)	TOTAL NO <sub>2</sub> ELEV. STKS.	TOTAL NO <sub>2</sub> ELEV. STKS.	SO <sub>2</sub> STK. ED. (MT/Yr)	SO <sub>2</sub> STK. PER STK. (MT/Yr)	PARTIC. PER STK. (MT/Yr)	N-SO <sub>2</sub> FRACTION (g/-normalized)	N-PART. FRACTION	STACK HEIGHT (m)	EXIT VELOC. (m/s)	EXIT RADIUS (m)	STACK EXIT TIME (hrs)	SAMPLE SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
17 LAKE ONTARIO CEMENT	PICTON	TRE	7748.2	114.5	6	6	1	7748.2	114.5	1.000	37.00	26.20	1.20	4.50	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
18 LAKEVIEW O.S.	MISSISSAUGA	TOR	41856	800.0	4	4	1	41856	800.0	1.000	150.50	28.80	2.97	4.11	PARL.
19 LERNOX O.S.	BATH	KIN	0.0	0.0	2	2	0	0.0	0.0	1.000	199.00	55.14	3.76	4.14	PARL.
20 HALLETTE DKAUT PAP	SMOOTH ROCK FALLS	TDM	281.1	1806.2	9	7	1	251.5	1340.2	0.895	38.40	14.69	0.46	3.32	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
21 NANTICOKE O.S.	NANTICOKE	SDA	169000	2400	2	2	0	29.6	466.0	0.105	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
22 NORTHERN PINKIDENT LT	TORONTO	TOR	7.1	15.6	7	0	1	7.1	15.6	1.000	198.10	30.50	2.75	5.94	PARL.
23 ONTARIO PAPER CO LT	THOROLD	SDA	1099.2	5.7	7	7	0	1099.2	5.7	1.000	14.00	10.80	0.30	5.47	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
24 PETROSAR LTD	CORUNNA	WIN	6259.6	807.5	4	2	1	4094.2	605.5	0.750	41.70	25.70	0.54	3.38	PARL.
25 POLYSAR LTD	SARNIA	WIN	1650.6	139.2	40	8	0	1563.4	201.8	0.250	14.00	0.00	0.50	-999	PARL.
26 ST. MARY CEMENT	ST. MARY	LON	5194.2	124.0	39	34	1	1650.6	139.2	1.000	91.50	20.00	2.82	4.43	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
27 STRATHCONA PAPER CO	NAFANEE	LON	20.1	1.9	1	0	1	278.9	24.4	0.275	88.39	5.10	0.38	4.00	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
28 SUNCOR	SARNIA	KIN	2662.0	95.0	20	17	0	2315.3	35.0	0.001	55.78	18.10	0.84	4.50	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
29 TELACO CAN (NANT.)	NANTICOKE	SDA	6210.0	561.0	5	4	0	20.1	1.9	1.000	9.10	9.40	0.76	4.63	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
								2393.5	55.0	0.899	77.72	4.93	1.48	6.10	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
								268.5	40.0	0.101	38.10	3.78	0.73	5.42	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
								4716.9	398.4	0.760	112.00	8.60	5.05	5.06	SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
								1493.1	162.6	0.240	56.00	4.50	1.05	5.84	NO <sub>2</sub> OF OP SO <sub>2</sub> PARL.
										TEST	MAX.	MAX.	MAX.	MAX.	
										SO <sub>2</sub>	199.00	33.14	3.76	6.1700	19
										1.000	17417				29

NOTES: - New Source Selections/People - New Source Selections/Replacement Plans for those without MOE data.

- Preliminary Selections of Sae - Preliminary Selections of Sae Run from the MOE database

(0 refers to a virtual source, others are elevated sources).

- Normalized SO<sub>2</sub> and Particulate - Normalized SO<sub>2</sub> and Particulate Emissions per Stack.

Sources: Plants have been reduced from 764 to 160 by applying the criteria of a building height of 14.0 m.

Thus all stacks of elevation less than or equal to 28.0 m become virtual (building "stack") sources

Processing: Elevated source runs have been reduced from 160 to 34 by aggregating emissions from individual stacks to stacks of similar characteristics. Additionally, where emissions exist for numerous individual stacks less than 7% of total emissions, the lowest 10% of emissions are aggregated to a single virtual source. (Note: individual stacks are listed as elevated or virtual).

Virtual Source: Plants would utilize identical building parameters. For example, Toronto millinery would be used for 8 plants.

If building parameters are not to be identical, a single building source can be applied to all 6 plants.

Thus the total number of virtual runs drops from 12 to 6. This then reduces the total number of all runs from 49 to 40.

All original data on stack characteristics and emissions experimentation among stacks are as provided by MOE. Air Brannan Brannan current to 2005/06.

MULTI-INDUSTRY FILE	ABBRVIATIONS
ASN	Kierston
LSN	London
SIM	Sarnia
SCO	South St. Mary
THU	Thunder Bay
TDM	Toronto
TOR	Toronto
WIN	Windsor

As previously, annual average (.AVG file) concentrations were generated from each individual source. In the present case, a dispersion field (footprint) was generated for each source at each plant (i.e., 49 in total).

Each source at each plant was assigned an emission rate of 1 g/s. Apportionment of emissions from the stacks at each plant were normalized separately for SO<sub>2</sub> and particulate matter emissions. This allowed the 1 g/s footprints to be subsequently scaled down, and superimposed to yield a separate summary footprint equivalent to a total 1 g/s plant emission rate for SO<sub>2</sub> and particulate.

The appropriate summary footprint was then be scaled up or down according to the particular estimate of total plant emissions.

## A.5 QUALITY CONTROL

As previously, DOS batch programs were developed to maintain control over file organization, manipulation, and execution. Initial checks on output confirmed that 80386/387 computers provided by The DPA Group and MOE were producing identical results for the same source run.<sup>1</sup> Exhibit A.2 presents this under the columns "AST80386" and "H-R80386", respectively.

As a final check on input data quality prior to model run execution, all source files (.SRC) were concatenated to a QC-file for manual proofing of all data values. Documentation is provided in Exhibit A.3. As runs were executed, successful

---

<sup>1</sup> Two computers were used to reduce the elapsed time needed for the dispersion modelling.





EXHIBIT A.3: CHECK -- IMPORT OF ELEVATED .SRC FILES

PLANT				STACK	STACK	STACK	EXIT		BLDG.	
I.D.	PLANT NAME	X	Y	HEIGHT	RADIUS	TEMP	VELOC.	g/s	HEIGHT	WIDTH
		(m)	(m)	(m)	(m)	(oK)	(m/s)		(m)	(m)
600020	ABITIBI PRICE FWD	0	0	34.25	1.29	307	6.48	1	14	50
200056	BEAVER WOOD FIBRE	0	0	30.00	0.45	366	15.69	1	14	50
400004	CANADA CEMENT LAFARGE	0	0	46.00	0.75	358	30.70	1	14	50
400004	CANADA CEMENT LAFARGE	0	0	76.00	1.55	479	8.60	1	14	50
100031	C-I-L	0	0	32.00	1.50	472	21.70	1	14	50
300230	CANADA METAL CO. LTD.	0	0	46.00	0.90	352	31.36	1	14	50
202502	DOFASCO INC	0	0	44.00	3.05	477	5.09	1	14	50
202502	DOFASCO INC.	0	0	69.00	1.45	450	11.75	1	14	50
603005	DOMTAR PACKAGING LIMITED	0	0	30.00	0.45	366	3.00	1	14	50
503006	EDDY FOREST PRODUCTS	0	0	77.00	1.83	477	13.91	1	14	50
503006	EDDY FOREST PRODUCTS	0	0	31.00	0.92	341	5.60	1	14	50
100015	FEDERAL WHITE CEMENT LTD.	0	0	32.60	0.92	573	0.30	1	14	50
603007	GREAT LAKES FOREST	0	0	61.26	1.98	422	3.10	1	14	50
603007	GREAT LAKES FOREST	0	0	50.00	1.22	373	7.23	1	14	50
101303	IMPERIAL OIL	0	0	91.00	1.60	617	11.20	1	14	50
500004	KIDD CREEK MINES LTD.	0	0	43.00	0.61	355	27.70	1	14	50
500004	KIDD CREEK MINES LTD.	0	0	74.00	0.86	360	16.00	1	14	50
400029	LAKE ONTARIO CEMENT	0	0	37.00	1.20	450	26.20	1	14	50
400005	LENNOX GENERATING STATION	0	0	199.00	3.76	414	35.14	1	14	50
305801	LAKEVIEW GENERATING STATION	0	0	150.30	2.97	411	28.80	1	14	50
503001	MALLETTE KRAFT PULP&PAPER	0	0	38.40	0.46	332	14.69	1	14	50
205805	NANTICOKE GENERATING STATIO	0	0	198.10	2.75	394	30.50	1	14	50
400063	NITROCHEM (BROCKVILLE CHEM)	0	0	41.00	1.20	327	8.36	1	14	50
200055	ONTARIO PAPER CO. LTD.	0	0	41.70	0.54	358	25.70	1	14	50
301302	PETROCANADA CLARKSON	0	0	70.00	1.05	386	19.70	1	14	50
301302	PETROCANADA CLARKSON	0	0	51.00	1.05	491	34.80	1	14	50
101702	PETROSAR LTD.	0	0	61.00	1.40	441	6.40	1	14	50
101709	POLYSAR LTD.	0	0	91.50	2.82	443	20.00	1	14	50
100342	ST. MARY CEMENT	0	0	88.39	0.38	400	5.10	1	14	50
100342	ST. MARY CEMENT	0	0	55.78	0.84	450	18.10	1	14	50
101306	SUNCOR	0	0	77.72	1.68	610	4.93	1	14	50
101306	SUNCOR	0	0	38.10	0.73	542	3.78	1	14	50
201308	TEXACO CANADA (NANTICOKE)	0	0	112.00	3.05	506	8.60	1	14	50
201308	TEXACO CANADA (NANTICOKE)	0	0	56.00	1.05	584	4.50	1	14	50

termination was verified in each case and the number of valid/invalid met-cases compared with those recorded in the previous study for each met-zone.

## A.6 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Comparison was made between previous study output and present study output for a virtual source in Toronto. Point by point comparison is presented in Exhibit A.2. "TOR-PREV" refers to the previous study, while "AST80386" and "H-R80386" refer to the present study. This showed that the doubling of building height and halving of building width resulted in output concentration data on the 4 km resolution grid that was within about  $\pm 4\%$  of previous results. This agreed with expectations for these sources confirming that the previous building source assumptions would yield representative dispersion footprints for most virtual sources in Ontario.

Output of several multi-source plants was tabulated via Lotus 123 and individual receptor concentrations inspected and compared. Anticipated trends in comparing high-elevated, moderately elevated, and virtual source-generated receptor concentrations were confirmed.

An example is provided in Exhibit A.4. While it is generally the case that annual average ambient concentrations resulting from virtual source assumptions exceed those resulting from elevated source assumptions (on the 24 x 24 km, 4 km resolution grid), it can be observed that for 10 - 15% of the receptors, the reverse is true.

Comparing elevated and virtual source effects on annual average ambient concentrations in this example:



# EXHIBIT A.4: COMPARISON OF ELEVATED AND VIRTUAL SOURCES ON A 4-KM RECEPTOR GRID (PETROCANADA, CLARKSON)

X	Y	Distance (Ea)	Concentration (µg/m³)		Difference Blg.-70m	Difference Blg.-51a
			70m Stack	51a Stack		
-24000	-24000	0	0.00112	0.00082	0.05	27.09
-20000	-24000	0	0.00105	0.00038	0.01060	22.36
-16000	-24000	0	0.00156	0.00162	39.39	49.48
-12000	-24000	0	0.00170	0.00124	41.63	51.01
-8000	-24000	0	0.00164	0.00133	0.00400	60.22
-4000	-24000	0	0.00229	0.00192	0.00367	50.37
0	-24000	0	0.00113	0.00278	0.00617	41.61
4000	-24000	0	0.00537	0.00391	0.00432	30.44
8000	-24000	0	0.00511	0.00451	0.00402	45.40
12000	-24000	0	0.00471	0.00485	0.00792	47.62
16000	-24000	0	0.00321	0.00298	0.00083	53.44
20000	-24000	0	0.00384	0.00253	0.00515	44.01
24000	-24000	0	0.00179	0.00155	0.00307	44.49
-24000	-20000	0	0.00121	0.00094	0.00078	-42.47
-20000	-20000	0	0.00132	0.00108	0.00154	14.16
-16000	-20000	0	0.00192	0.00104	0.00146	6.34
-12000	-20000	0	0.00183	0.00150	0.00287	36.94
-8000	-20000	0	0.00207	0.00163	0.00474	57.96
-4000	-20000	0	0.00241	0.00204	0.00317	37.69
0	-20000	0	0.00194	0.00159	0.00468	48.59
4000	-20000	0	0.00514	0.00419	0.00426	51.28
8000	-20000	0	0.00533	0.00454	0.00486	44.24
12000	-20000	0	0.00513	0.00464	0.00138	57.23
16000	-20000	0	0.00457	0.00456	0.01250	65.54
20000	-20000	0	0.00370	0.00399	0.00745	53.30
24000	-20000	0	0.00257	0.00199	0.00414	47.95
-24000	-16000	0	0.00197	0.00199	0.00210	21.83
-20000	-16000	0	0.00050	0.00049	0.00076	-17.04
-16000	-16000	0	0.00137	0.00138	0.00934	-47.48
-12000	-16000	0	0.00156	0.00193	0.00213	21.53
-8000	-16000	0	0.00161	0.00168	0.00423	25.94
-4000	-16000	0	0.00242	0.00225	0.00473	43.66
0	-16000	0	0.00328	0.00249	0.00992	47.22
4000	-16000	0	0.00524	0.00519	0.01293	51.57
8000	-16000	0	0.00603	0.00510	0.01490	34.50
12000	-16000	0	0.00462	0.00384	0.00875	48.81
16000	-16000	0	0.00342	0.00327	0.00931	52.17
20000	-16000	0	0.00269	0.00216	0.00425	59.01
24000	-16000	0	0.00254	0.00213	0.00315	36.21
-24000	-12000	0	0.00193	0.00095	0.00947	-15.34
-20000	-12000	0	0.00120	0.00095	0.00119	-1.77
-16000	-12000	0	0.00110	0.00094	0.00415	53.34

  

X	Y	Distance (Ea)	Concentration (µg/m³)		Difference Blg.-70m	Difference Blg.-51a
			70m Stack	51a Stack		
-12000	-12000	0	0.00227	0.00177	0.00316	37.75
-8000	-12000	0	0.00262	0.00292	0.00673	45.59
-4000	-12000	0	0.00340	0.00295	0.00991	66.84
0	-12000	0	0.00687	0.00561	0.01436	60.72
4000	-12000	0	0.01028	0.00823	0.02745	67.93
8000	-12000	0	0.00697	0.00544	0.01991	72.49
12000	-12000	0	0.00368	0.00391	0.00926	64.98
16000	-12000	0	0.00392	0.00299	0.00716	59.82
20000	-12000	0	0.00312	0.00261	0.00738	55.21
24000	-12000	0	0.00321	0.00268	0.00368	42.78
-24000	-8000	0	0.00433	0.00167	0.00665	-137.41
-20000	-8000	0	0.00143	0.00126	0.00114	6.40
-16000	-8000	0	0.00173	0.00146	0.00170	16.30
-12000	-8000	0	0.00195	0.00193	0.00200	44.32
-8000	-8000	0	0.00365	0.00249	0.00596	58.36
-4000	-8000	0	0.00413	0.00324	0.00368	76.92
0	-8000	0	0.01047	0.00891	0.02642	66.41
4000	-8000	0	0.01204	0.00957	0.04877	69.38
8000	-8000	0	0.00453	0.00432	0.01628	73.62
12000	-8000	0	0.00942	0.00837	0.02120	72.81
16000	-8000	0	0.00373	0.00349	0.00364	60.39
20000	-8000	0	0.00399	0.00320	0.01053	58.42
24000	-8000	0	0.00629	0.00362	0.00747	68.99
-24000	-4000	0	0.00356	0.00213	0.00747	51.14
-20000	-4000	0	0.00346	0.00213	0.00163	-101.54
-16000	-4000	0	0.00302	0.00214	0.00163	-112.08
-12000	-4000	0	0.00307	0.00219	0.00178	-51.48
-8000	-4000	0	0.00344	0.00219	0.00224	-52.01
-4000	-4000	0	0.00327	0.00228	0.00517	44.42
0	-4000	0	0.00623	0.00428	0.01849	66.25
4000	-4000	0	0.01018	0.01025	0.00917	76.98
8000	-4000	0	0.00898	0.00893	0.00961	79.44
12000	-4000	0	0.00741	0.00624	0.02786	70.13
16000	-4000	0	0.00532	0.00464	0.02127	74.32
20000	-4000	0	0.00532	0.00464	0.01164	70.94
24000	-4000	0	0.00368	0.00374	0.00949	60.29
-24000	0	0	0.00358	0.00214	0.00717	54.34
-20000	0	0	0.00395	0.00214	0.00214	-90.06
-16000	0	0	0.00334	0.00180	0.00180	-78.41
-12000	0	0	0.00334	0.00180	0.00180	-65.24
-8000	0	0	0.00332	0.00180	0.00180	-42.18
-4000	0	0	0.00332	0.00180	0.00180	-20.95
-24000	0	0	0.00332	0.00180	0.00180	26.43



- . For half to two thirds of the receptors, elevated source results are within a factor of 2 of the virtual source results.
- . The largest absolute differences and larger % differences occur at the receptor locations nearest the source.
- . The smallest absolute differences and largest % differences tend to occur near the grid perimeter.
- . 98% of the receptor grid concentrations resulting from virtual source assumptions fall within the same order of magnitude as those resulting from elevated source assumptions.
- . The taller stack always yields marginally higher resultant concentrations than the shorter (intermediate) stack. This would not generally be the case but can in this instance be attributed to the higher buoyancy and plume rise of the shorter stack.

## A.7 SUMMARY

In a previous study to estimate the public benefits of proposed changes to Regulation 308, extensive development of representative meteorology for the entire Province of Ontario was carried out. Dispersion modelling was performed yielding annual average ambient concentration grids. Additional data were mapped in and key benefits were determined to be attributable to reductions in SO<sub>2</sub> and particulate emissions.

The present study took a closer look at SO<sub>2</sub> and particulate emissions. A statistically representative sampling of emitters of these pollutants was made and detailed source characteristics obtained. Data reduction was carried out and model runs were executed.

Results were compared with the previous study. Additional data were mapped in and comparable benefits determined.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Exposure-Response Functions**

## B.1 INTRODUCTION

An exposure-response function predicts how health and other factors, such as visibility and materials damage, change as the concentration of a contaminant changes. Exposure-response functions are available for health effects, materials damage and visibility due to sulphur dioxide and suspended particulate matter emissions.

## B.2 SULPHUR DIOXIDE FUNCTIONS

### B.2.1 Mortality

An exposure-response function is available for deaths attributable to sulphur dioxide. The function calculates absolute change in the number of annual deaths.

$$\text{Deaths}^1 = 1.670 \times 10^{-5} \times \text{POP} \times (\text{SO}_{2A} - \text{SO}_{2B})$$

Where:

- SO<sub>2A</sub> = The SO<sub>2</sub> concentration for a grid cell under existing regulations.
- SO<sub>2B</sub> = The SO<sub>2</sub> concentration for a grid cell under a specific implementation scenario.
- POP = The population of a grid cell.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the coefficient has been changed from that used in the previous study to correct an arithmetic error in the derivation of the function caused by the selection of an incorrect coefficient from a table of regression results.

The function presented above is the central case estimate for reduction in annual mortality due to reduced concentrations of sulphur dioxide. The low case is calculated by applying the lower bound estimate of the value of a statistical life to the calculated reduction in mortality.

### **B.2.2 Hospital Days for Respiratory Conditions**

The function of hospital days for respiratory conditions (HDRC) is:

$$\text{HDRC} = 4.0 \times 10^{-4} \times (\text{SO}_{2\text{A}} - \text{SO}_{2\text{B}}) \times \text{POP}$$

The variables  $\text{SO}_{2\text{A}}$ ,  $\text{SO}_{2\text{B}}$  and POP have the same meaning as in the mortality equation.

The lower bound estimate is obtained by replacing  $4.0 \times 10^{-4}$  in the central case equation presented above with  $1.5 \times 10^{-4}$ . In other words the lower bound is 0.375 times the central case.

### **B.2.3 Hospital Admissions for Respiratory Disease**

The function for hospital admissions for respiratory disease (HARD) is:

$$\text{HARD} = 4.065 \times 10^{-5} \times (\text{SO}_{2\text{A}} - \text{SO}_{2\text{B}}) \times \text{POP}$$

The variables  $\text{SO}_{2\text{A}}$ ,  $\text{SO}_{2\text{B}}$  and POP have the same meaning as in the mortality equation.

The lower bound estimate is calculated by replacing  $4.065 \times 10^{-5}$  in the central case equation presented above with  $0.63 \times 10^{-5}$ . Alternately, the lower bound is 0.155 times the central case.



## B.3 PARTICULATE MATTER FUNCTIONS

Six exposure response functions exist for PM. They relate to:

- . death;
- . emergency room visits;
- . restricted activity days;
- . chronic obstructive pulmonary disease;
- . visibility; and
- . materials damage.

In each of the functions presented below the symbols have the following definitions.

- $PM_A$  = The original PM concentration for a grid cell.
- $PM_B$  = The PM concentration for a grid cell under the scenario considered.
- E = The mean 1986 rate of exchange (1.3894) to convert 1986 U.S. to 1986 Canadian dollars.
- HF = A factor (2.8) to convert the population of a grid cell to the number of households.
- POP = The population of a grid cell.

### B.3.1 Death

$$\text{Deaths} = 2.21 \times 10^{-6} \times \text{POP} \times (PM_A - PM_B)$$

This equation gives the change in annual deaths due to a change in particulate matter concentration. The lower bound and central value are calculated by applying the corresponding values of a statistical life to the reduction in annual mortality estimated using the above equation.

### **B.3.2 Emergency Room Visits**

$$ERV = 1.3 \times 10^{-4} \times \text{POP} \times (\text{PM}_A - \text{PM}_B)$$

The change in the number of emergency room visits per year, ERV, is related to the change in particulate matter concentration. The lower bound estimate of emergency room visits is calculated by replacing the central case coefficient of  $1.3 \times 10^{-4}$  by  $1.2 \times 10^{-5}$ .

### **B.3.3 Restricted Activity Days**

$$\text{RAD} = 2.736 \times 10^{-2} \times \text{POP} \times (\text{PM}_A - \text{PM}_B) - \text{Emergency Room Visits}$$

The change in the number of restricted activity days, RAD, is reduced by the change in the number of emergency room visits (ERV) to avoid double counting. The lower bound estimate of restricted activity days is calculated by replacing the central case coefficient of  $2.736 \times 10^{-2}$  by  $1.938 \times 10^{-2}$ . In other words, the lower bound is equal to 0.70833 times the central case.

### **B.3.4 Visibility Effects**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total Value} \\ \text{Per Year} &= E \times 206 \times \ln(\text{PM}_A/\text{PM}_B) \times \text{POP}/\text{HF} \end{aligned}$$

The lower bound estimate is calculated as 0.5 times the central case.

This function returns an annual dollar value for improved visibility.

### **B.3.5 Materials Damage**

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Total Value} \\ \text{Per Year} \end{array} = E \times 7.4 \times (PM_A - PM_B) \times POP/HF$$

This function also returns an annual dollar value of reduced materials damage.

To get the lower bound estimate, the central case coefficient of 7.4 is replaced by 0.52. In other words, the lower bound is 0.07027 times the central case.

## **B.4 REFERENCES**

### **Sulphur Dioxide Damage**

Plagiannakos, T. and J. Parker. "An Assessment of Air Pollution Effects on Human Health in Ontario." Economics and Forecasts Division, Ontario Hydro, File No.: 706.01 (#260), 1988.

### **Particulate Matter Damage**

#### **Mortality**

Evans, J.S., T. Tosteson, and P.L. Kinney. "Cross-Sectional Mortality Studies and Air Pollution Risk Assessment." Environmental International, (10) pp. 55-83, 1984.

Mazumdar, S., H. Schimmel, and I.T.T. Higgins. "Relationship of Daily Mortality to Air Pollution: An Analysis of 14 London Winters, 1958/59-1971/72." Archives of Environmental Health. (38) pp. 213-220, 1982.

Ostro, B.D. "A Search For a Threshold in the Relationship of Air Pollution to Mortality: A Reanalysis of London Winters." Environmental Health Perspectives. (58) pp. 397-399, 1984.

Ostro, B.D. Presentation to the EPA Clean Air Science Advisory Committee. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. December 1985.

Schwartz, J.S. and A. Marcus. "Statistical Reanalysis of Data Relating Mortality to Air Pollution During London Winters 1958-1972." Working Paper, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC, 1986.

### Emergency Room Visits

Samet, J.M., Y. Bishop, R.E. Speizer, J.D. Spengler, and B.G. Ferris. "The Relationship Between Air Pollution and Emergency Room Visits in an Industrial Community." Journal of the Air Pollution Control Association. (31) pp. 236-40, 1981.

### Restricted Activity Days

Ostro, B.D. "The Effects of Air Pollution on Work Loss and Morbidity." Journal of Environmental Economics and Management. (10) pp. 371-382, 1983.

Ostro, B.D. "Air Pollution and Morbidity Revisited: A Specification Test."  
Journal of Environmental Economics and Management. (14) pp. 87-98.

## **APPENDIX C**

### **Regulation 308 Implementation Scenarios**

## REGULATION 308 IMPLEMENTATION SCENARIOS

Five implementation scenarios for the proposed revisions to Regulation 308 are defined in terms of level of control technology and implementation date. The proposed revisions to Regulation 308 identify three levels of control technology that can be applied to different categories of contaminants. They are:

- . LAER, or Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (the most stringent form of control);
- . BACT, or Best Available Control Technology; and
- . NSPS, or New Source Performance Standards (the least stringent control).

The Discussion Paper does not define these levels of control explicitly, but suggests that the corresponding control technology in the United States provides a useful reference point. Senes defined the specific control technologies and corresponding emissions that form the basis for this analysis. The interested reader is referred to their report for further details.

The implementation scenarios specify the level of control to be applied to each category of contaminants. Exhibit C.1 shows the proposed level of control for each contaminant type by scenario. There are more LAER controls in Scenario B where stringent emission controls are considered, and more NSPS controls under the less stringent control scenario (Scenario C).

Scenario D is defined using two levels of control rather than three levels as assumed in Scenario A. In practice Scenarios A and D are the same. The contaminants governed by less stringent controls in Scenario A are usually found in emission streams to which more stringent controls must be applied, so they are also controlled at this more stringent level. Scenario E is the same as Scenario A



---

## EXHIBIT C.1:      PROPOSED SCENARIOS

---

SCENARIO	A Initial	B More Stringent	C Less Stringent	D 2 Tier
<b>CONTAMINANT GROUP</b>				
Volatile Organic Compounds				
Chlorinated	LAER	LAER	BACT	LAER
Aliphatics	NSPS	BACT	NSPS	BACT
Aromatics	BACT	LAER	NSPS	BACT
Esters/Alcohols/Esters/				
Aldehydes/Ketones	BACT	LAER	NSPS	BACT
Mercaptans	NSPS	BACT	NSPS	BACT
Particulates Associated				
Organics	LAER	LAER	BACT	LAER
Metals	LAER	LAER	BACT	LAER
Other Particulates	BACT	LAER	NSPS	BACT
Semi-Volatile Organics	BACT	LAER	NSPS	BACT
Pesticides	BACT	LAER	NSPS	BACT
Corrosives				
Acids	BACT	LAER	NSPS	BACT
Bases	BACT	LAER	NSPS	BACT
Other	BACT	LAER	NSPS	BACT
Other	BACT	LAER	NSPS	BACT

### IMPLEMENTATION

SCENARIO	A,B,C,D	E*
New Facilities	1989	1989
Existing Facilities		
Contaminant Group:		
LAER	1994	2004
BACT	1994	2009
NSPS	1999	2014

---

\* Same as Scenario A except for implementation schedule.

---

except for the implementation schedule. The estimated emissions provided by Senes for Scenario E correspond to the first phase of the implementation schedule for Scenario A.

These control scenarios were developed in consultation with the Ministry of the Environment. Information on the different levels of control technology is available in the MOE Discussion Paper. The Senes report specifies the control technology assumed for each contaminant group and industry sector. It also estimates the resulting emissions by contaminant for each scenario.





